DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 284 HE 019 804

TITLE	Retrospect and Prospect. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (25th, Bal Harbour, Florida, November 24-26, 1985).
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-88044-077-5
PUB DATE	Nov 85
NOTE	116p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-1192 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Accrediting Agencies; Black Colleges; College Role; Educational Quality; Federal Government; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; International Educational Exchange; *National Organizations; Public Relations; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*American Association of State Colleges and Univs; United States Information Agency

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the 1985 annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) are presented. Contents include: three addresses and a lecture, remarks about/from distinguished alumni who received awards, brief summaries of additional addresses, reports from AASCU officers and projects, and an agenda of the annual meeting. Addresses/reports and authors include: "Retrospect and Prospect" (Harland Cleveland); "The Federal Role in Higher Education" (E. Thomas Coleman); "USIA and Higher Education" (Marvin Stone); "2010: The Next Twenty-Five Years" (Kala M. Stroup); "Report on AASCU Foundation" (Joseph A. Caputo); "Report of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation" (Ellis E. McCune); "Report of the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges" (Joyce Payne); "Special Recommendations for Public Relations Campaign for State Colleges and Universities" (George Ayers); "Report of the Chairman" (Aubrey K. Lucas); "Report of the President" (Allan W. Ostar); and "Report of the Treasurer" (Myron L. Coulter). Topics on which resolutions are presented include: a new organization called "Accuracy in Academia," functions of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, Higher Education Amendments of 1985, and missions and responsibilities of urban state colleges and universities. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275284

A A S C U

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AHSCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 019 804

2

Proceedings

RETROSPECT and PROSPECT

25th Annual Meeting

Proceedings

of the

25th Annual Meeting

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

November 24-26, 1985
Bal Harbour, Florida

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President

Copyright 1986 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
Meeting (25th : 1985 : Bal Harbour, Fla.)
Retrospect and prospect.

1. Education, Higher--United States--Aims and objectives--Congresses. 2. Federal aid to higher education--United States--Congresses. I. Title.
LB2301.A26 1985 378.73 86-20674
ISBN 0-88044-077-5

Contents

1985 Final Program/1

General Session Addresses

Retrospect and Prospect/19
Harlan Cleveland

The Federal Role in Higher Education/29
The Honorable E. Thomas Coleman

International Address

USIA and Higher Education/41
Marvin Stone

President-to-Presidents Lecture

2010: The Next Twenty-Five Years/49
Kala M. Stroup

Distinguished Alumni Awards

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Award Presentation/61
John L. Green, Jr.

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus/63
The Honorable Robert Dole

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Award Presentation/65
John E. Worthen

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus/67
Jim Davis

Concurrent Session Addresses/69

Spouses Program Addresses/77

Plenary Session

Report of the Chairman/81
Aubrey K. Lucas

Report of the President/84
Allan W. Ostar

Report of the Treasurer/89
Myron L. Coulter

Financial Data/90

Report on AASCU Foundation/98
Joseph A. Caputo

Report of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation/101
Ellis E. McCune

Report of the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges/103
Joyce Payne

Special Recommendation for Public Relations Campaign for State Colleges and Universities/105
George Ayers

Resolutions/106

President Williams Named Honorary Chairman of AASCU/117

Election of Officers and Directors/120

Retrospect and Prospect

Final Program
AASCU 25th Annual Meeting
November 24-26, 1985
Bal Harbour, Florida

FRIDAY, November 22

AASCU Foundation Board Meeting
1:30 p.m.-6:00 p.m.

SATURDAY, November 23

Meeting of Board of Directors
8:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Chair: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi

Meeting of Board of Directors and State Representatives
1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.
Chairs: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi and President Trevor Colbourn, University of Central Florida
Guest: T. H. Bell, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Utah, and Chair, National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities

National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities Meeting
1:20 p.m.-6:00 p.m.
Chair: T. H. Bell, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Utah

Council of State Representatives
2:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.
Chair: President Trevor Colbourn, University of Central Florida

Meeting of Board of Directors and 1986 Committee Chairs
4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
Chair: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi

Orientation Meeting for International Guests
4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
Chair: Frank Klassen, Vice President for International Programs, AASCU

SUNDAY, November 24

Workshop for New Member Presidents/Chancellors and Spouses
8:00 a.m.-9:00 a.m.
Presiding: Chancellor Fred J. Taylor, University of Arkansas at Monticello

Workshop Agenda

Presidents/Chancellors and Spouses General Session
8:00 a.m.-8:45 a.m.
Presenters: Chancellor and Mrs. Fred J. Taylor, University of Arkansas at Monticello

Clinics for Presidents and Chancellors
8:45 a.m.-9:00 a.m.
"Managing the Institution's Financial Resources"
Presenter: President Julio Leon, Missouri Southern State College
Resources: President Dennis D. Bell, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and President Bruce H. Carpenter, Eastern Montana College

9:45 a.m.-10:30 a.m.
"Enhancing the Institution's Image and Building Community Relations"
Presenter: Chancellor Thomas M. Stauffer, University of Houston-Clear Lake (TX)
Resources: President David E. Gilbert, Eastern Oregon State College and President Warren B. Armstrong, Wichita State University (KS)

11:00 a.m.-11:45 a.m.
"Guiding the Institution's Academic Development"
Presenter: Chancellor Martha K. Piper, University of Houston-Victoria (TX)
Resources: President Roy Troutt, University of Science and Art of Oklahoma and President William R. Nester, Kearney State College (NE)

11:45 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
"Governance of the Institution"
Presenter: President John Worthen, Ball State University (IN)
Resources: Chancellor Michael Paradise, University of Alaska, Juneau and President Bill J. Franklin, Lamar University (TX)

Meeting of the Board of Directors
8:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Chair: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi

AASCU 1986 Mission to Malaysia Meeting
9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.
Chair: President Lloyd D. Vincent, Angelo State University (TX)

Rural Panel Discussions

"AASCU Institutions and Rural Development"
10:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m.
Chair: President Dale Lick, Georgia Southern College

"The Institutional Mission and Rural Development"
Chair: President David Gilbert, Eastern Oregon State College

"Public Service Program at AASCU Agricultural Institutions"
Chair: H. Edward Breece, Chairman, Department of Agriculture, Western Illinois University

"Higher Education and Rural Development: The Need for Statewide Planning"
Chair: President Janet Greenwood, Longwood College (VA)

"Building Relationships with the Private Sector"
Chair: President Dale Lick, Georgia Southern College

1986 Mission to Italy Meeting
10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon
Chair: President Edmond L. Volpe, City University of New York, College of Staten Island

Urban Affairs Luncheon Program
12:00 noon-1:30 p.m.
"Urban State Colleges and Universities--Retrospect and Prospect"
Chair: Chancellor Alexander F. Schilt, University of Houston-Downtown (TX)
Presenters: Chancellor Arnold B. Grobman, University of Missouri at St. Louis and Alfred Rollins, Professor of History and former President, Old Dominion University (VA)

1985 Committee Meetings

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Academic Personnel and Academic Freedom
Chair: President Nathan Weiss, Kean College of New Jersey

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Alternatives and Innovation
Chair: President George A. Pruitt, Thomas A. Edison State College (NJ)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Association Research
Chair: President Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Athletics
Chair: President F. Kent Wyatt, Delta State University (MS)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Communications Technology
Chair: President Dallas K. Beal, Connecticut State University

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Cultural Affairs
Chair: President Donald J. Ayo, Nicholls State University (LA)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Task Force on Educational Equity
Chair: President Harold Eickhoff, Trenton State College (NJ)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Task Force on Excellence in Education
Chair: President John W. Porter, Eastern Michigan University
Guests: Richard P. Mills, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education, State of New Jersey; John King, Former President, Emporia State University (KS) and Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director, National School Boards Association

1:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on External Relations
Chair: President George E. Ayers, Chicago State University (IL)
Guest: Michael Carberry, President H. J. Kaufman & Associates

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Federal Relations
Chair: President Natale A. Sicuro, Southern Oregon State College

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Health Affairs
Chair: President Ronald E. Beller, East Tennessee State University

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on National Service
Chair: President Robert O. Riggs, Austin Peay State University (TN)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Policies and Purposes
Chair: President Janet Greenwood, Longwood College (VA)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Science and Technology
Chair: President Saul K. Fenster, New Jersey
Institute of Technology

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Student Issues and Affairs
Chair: President Robert E. Glennen, Jr., Emporia
State University (KS)

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Committee on Urban Affairs
Chair: Chancellor Alexander F. Schilt, University
of Houston-Downtown (TX)
Guest: Margaret Wireman, Chief, Division of Technical Assistance,
Economic Development Administration

1:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Academic Affairs Resource Center
Chair: President Thomas A. Bond, Clarion
University of Pennsylvania

1:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Accreditation
Chair: President Ellis E. McCune, California State University, Hayward
Guests: Raymond Miller, President, Computing Sciences Accreditation Board; Claud Beckham, Executive Director, Computing Sciences Accreditation Board; Jane Mathews, President, American Physical Therapy Association; Robert Bartlett, APTA Task Force to Revise Accreditation Standards and Criteria, and Chairman, Department of Physical Therapy, Duke University Medical Center; and Richard M. Millard, President, Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Renewable Resources, and Rural Development
Chair: President Dale Lick, Georgia Southern College
Guests: Larry Miller, Executive Director, Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences, U.S. Department of Agriculture and John Stovall, Acting Executive Director, Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, Agency for International Development

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Conferences and Professional Development
Chair: Chancellor Fred J. Taylor, University of Arkansas at Monticello

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Corporate/College Relations
Chair: President Stephen Feldman, Western Connecticut State University
Guests: Edward Elmendorf, Vice President, University-Corporate Relations, Wood & Company, Inc.; Donald Honicky, AT&T; Hugh Gallagher, American Express; John Pritchard, Johnson & Higgins; and Dave Munger, Commission on Future Academic Leadership

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Economic Development
Chair: Chancellor Robert S. Swanson, University of Wisconsin-Stout

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Education for Careers
Chair: President James T. Amsler, Salem State College (MA)

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Governance
Chair: President Herb F. Reinhard, Jr., Morehead State University (KY)

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Graduate and Research Programs
Chair: President Jewel Plummer Cobb, California State University, Fullerton

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Humanities
Chair: President Roland Dille, Moorhead State University (MN)
Guests: John Andrews, Acting Director, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities and Sara Chapman, Assistant Director, Division of Education Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on International Programs
Chair: President Louis J. Rodriguez, Midwestern State University (TX)

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on State Relations
Chair: Chancellor William R. Monat, Board of Regents, Illinois

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Committee on Undergraduate Education
Chair: President James W. Strobel, Mississippi University for Women

4:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Joint Meeting of Committee on Undergraduate Education and Committee on the Academic Affairs Resource Center
Co-Chairs: President James W. Strobel, Mississippi University for Women and President Thomas A. Bond, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

General Session
5:30 p.m.-6:45 p.m.
"Retrospect and Prospect"
Presiding: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi
Welcome: President Gregory B. Wolfe, Florida International University
Keynote: Harlan Cleveland, Dean of the University of Minnesota Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, political scientist, and public executive

MONDAY, November 25

General Session
9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.
"The Federal Role in Higher Education"
Chair: President Natale A. Sicuro, Southern Oregon State College
Introduction: President Janet Gorman Murphy, Missouri Western State College
Presenter: The Honorable E. Thomas Coleman (R-MO), Ranking Minority Member, House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
Reactors: President Stephen Horn, California State University, Long Beach; Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds, California State University; and President Leonard Spearman, Texas Southern University

Concurrent Sessions

10:15 a.m.-11:30 a.m.
"Continuity and Change in Undergraduate Education--The AASCU Experience"
Chair: President James W. Strobel, Mississippi University for Women
Presenters: Alexander W. Astin, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles, and Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA; Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds, California State University; and President Thomas A. Bond, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

10:15 a.m.-11:30 a.m.
"Implementing Technology Innovations:
Reflections on Experiences"
Chair: Chancellor Martha Kime Piper, University of Houston-Victoria (TX)
Presenters: President Hoke L. Smith, Towson State University (MD); President Larry J. Blake, Oregon Institute of Technology; and Chancellor Philip R. Marshall, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

10:15 a.m.-11:45 a.m.
"AIDS on Campus: Legal and
Health Implications"

Resolutions Screening Committee Meeting
11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
Chair: President Stanley Rives, Eastern
Illinois University

Leadership Forums

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Enhancing Undergraduate Education:
Student Outcomes Perspective"
Facilitator: Ronald C. Eaglin, Interim Chancellor, Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina
Resources: James T. Murrell, Jr., Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mississippi University for Women and Sandra Stockholm, President of the Student Body, Mississippi University for Women

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Enhancing Undergraduate Education: External Influences--National Governors' Association and Education Commission of the States Initiatives"
Facilitator: Chancellor E. K. Fretwell Jr., University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Resources: Richard Mills, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education, State of New Jersey and Thomas Duncan, Special Assistant to the Governor, State of Missouri

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Enhancing Undergraduate Education: Faculty Development"
Facilitator: President Nathan Weiss, Kean College of New Jersey
Resource: Robert V. Edington, Provost, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Enhancing Undergraduate Education: Administrator as Agent of Change"
Facilitators: President William H. Capitan, Georgia Southwestern College and Chancellor H. Dean Propst, University of Georgia

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"A Look at the Presidency"
Facilitator: Chancellor David G. Brown, University of North Carolina at Asheville

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Institutional Role in Economic Development"
Facilitator: Chancellor Robert S. Swanson, University of Wisconsin-Stout
Resources: President Walter B. Waetjen, Cleveland State University (OH); Helen Roberts, Director, Urban Programs, AASCU; and Margaret Wireman, Chief, Division of Technical Assistance, Economic Development Administration

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Revenue Enhancement/Corporate College Relations at AASCU Institutions"
Facilitator: President G. Robert Ross, Western Washington University
Resources: President Sheldon Grebstein, State University College at Purchase (NY); President Gerald Lynch, City University of New York, John Jay College of Criminal Justice; Donald Honicky, AT&T; and Edward Elmendorf, Vice President, University/Corporate Relations, Wood & Co.

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Anticipating the 21st Century"
Resource: President Larry J. Blake, Oregon Institute of Technology

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for International Cooperation
in Higher Education"
Facilitator: Chancellor James H. Young, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Resources: Chancellor Myron L. Coulter, Western Carolina University (NC) and President Humphrey Tonkin, State University College at Potsdam (NY)

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Individual Campus Roles in the Multi-Campus System"
Facilitator: President Herb F. Reinhard, Morehead State University (KY)
Resources: Chancellor James O. Williams, Auburn University at Montgomery (AL), and Chancellor Lawrence K. Pettit, University System of South Texas

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Leadership in Continuing Education"
Facilitator: President George A. Pruitt, Thomas A. Edison State College (NJ)
Resource: Paul David Munger, Director, Commission on Future Academic Leadership

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Communications Technology and
Higher Education: A Discussion of the
Annenberg/CPB Project and the
PBS National Narrowcast Service"
Facilitator: President Dallas K. Beal, Connecticut State University
Resources: Mara Mayor, Director, The Annenberg/CPB Project and Dee Brock, Vice President, Adult Learning Service, PBS

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Minorities and Women in Higher Education"
Facilitator: President Margaret Preska, Mankato State University (MN)
Resources: President William J. Maxwell, Jersey City State College (NJ), and Chancellor James H. McCormick, State System of Higher Education, Pennsylvania

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
"Prospects for Excellence in Higher Education"
Facilitator: President John W. Porter, Eastern Michigan University
Resources: William S. Dunifon, Dean, College of Education, Illinois State University, and President Stanley P. Wagner, East Central Oklahoma State University

International Luncheon Program
1:00 p.m.-2:30 p.m.
"USIA and Higher Education"
Chair: President Louis J. Rodriguez, Midwestern State University (TX)
Presenter: Marvin L. Stone, Deputy Director, United States Information Agency

AASCU 1985 Mission to Indonesia Meeting
2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.

Subcommittee on State and Campus Governance of Policies and Purposes Committee
2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
Co-Chairs: President James B. Appleberry, Northern Michigan University, and Chancellor Edward M. Penson, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics Meeting
2:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.
Chair: President Leon Hibbs, Southeastern Oklahoma State University

"A Glimpse of the Future Through the Annenberg/CPB Project"
2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
Presenter: Mara Mayor, Director, The Annenberg/CPB Project

Meeting of Women Presidents/Chancellors
4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
Chair: President Alice Chandler, State University College at New Paltz (NY)

Meeting of Texas Presidents/Chancellors
5:00 p.m.-6:30 p.m.
Chair: President Louis J. Rodriguez, Midwestern State University (TX)

TUESDAY, November 26

Roundtable Discussions
8:00 a.m.-9:00 a.m.

"Ten Years of Title XII: New Directions for the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development"
Leaders: President Warren J. Baker, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and John Stovall, Acting Executive Director, BIFAD

"Peoples Republic of China Institutional Affiliations"
Leaders: President Donald R. Gerth, California State University, Sacramento, and Chancellor Thomas M. Stauffer, University of Houston-Clear Lake (TX)

"Korea Institutional Affiliations"
Leader: President Clyde Wingfield, Northern Illinois University

"Travel Services and Corporate Card Program"
Leader: Hugh Gallagher, Vice President, American Express Corporation, Travel Management Services

"Supplementary Compensation Program for Presidents/Chancellors"
Leader: Michael Nolan, The John O. Todd Organization

"Individual VISA/MasterCard Program"
Leader: Charles M. Hegarty, Vice President, MBank USA

"Institutional Comprehensive Insurance program"
Leader: John Pritchard, Vice President, Johnson & Higgins

"Patents and Subsequent Licensure"
Leader: Robert Goldsmith, Corporate Secretary and Director, Eastern Region, Research Corporation

"AASCU Cultural Affairs Network"
Leader: Sanford Z. Friedman, Kinsman Group

"Technology Park Development"
Leader: Ed Elmendorf, Executive Vice President, Wood & Company, Inc.

"Personal Computers"
Leader: Dennis Strittmatter, Vice President, Sears Business Centers

"Faculty/Staff Relocation Services"
Leader: Tom Higgins, Homequity, Inc.

"Office of Federal Programs"

"Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges"

Council of Presidents
9:15 a.m.-10:15 a.m.
Presiding: President Ronald Williams, Northeastern Illinois University
Agenda: Public Relations Campaign for State Colleges and Universities; Intercollegiate Athletics; and AASCU 3-year Program and Dues Schedule Adjournment

Council of Heads of State Systems
9:15 a.m.-10:15 a.m.
"Statewide Enrollment Planning: A New Approach to Forecasting"
Chair: Chancellor John B. Duff, Board of Regents of Higher Education, Massachusetts
Presenter: Laura B. Clausen, Director of Planning and Resource Development, Board of Regents of Higher Education, Massachusetts

Concurrent Sessions
10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon

"The Public Mission and Private Enterprise: Issues in Revenue Enhancement, Corporate/College Relations and Economic Development"
Chair: President Stephen Feldman, Western Connecticut State University
Presenters: Jana B. Matthews, President, NCHEMS Management Services, Inc.; J. Wade Gilley, Senior Vice President, George Mason University (VA); Ed Cooperman, Executive Vice President, Travel Management Services, American Express Corporation; and Chancellor Robert M. Bersi, University of Nevada System

"Minorities and Women in Higher Education: Past Accomplishments and Future Responsibilities"
Chair: President Harold Eickhoff, Trenton State College (NJ)
Presenters: President Miguel A. Nevarez, Pan American University (TX); President James A. Hefner, Jackson State University (MS); President Judith A. Sturnick, University of Maine at Farmington; and President Donald Gerth, California State University, Sacramento

President-to-Presidents Lecture
12:15 p.m.-1:30 p.m.
"2010--The Next 25"
Chair: President Jewel Plummer Cobb, California State University, Fullerton
Lecturer: Prsident Kala M. Stroup, Murray State University (KY)

Meetings of the 1986 Committees
1:45 p.m.-2:30 p.m.

Upper Level Committee Meeting
1:45 p.m.-2:30 p.m.
Chair: President Leo Goodman-Malamuth, Governors State University (IL)

Plenary Session
2:45 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
Presiding: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi
Parliamentarian: President James W. Cleary, California State University, Northridge

Agenda

- Report of the Chairman
President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi
- Report of the President
President Allan W. Ostar, AASCU
- Report of the Secretary/Treasurer
Chancellor Myron L. Coulter, Western Carolina University (NC)
- Report on AASCU Foundation
President Joseph A. Caputo, Millersville University of Pennsylvania
- Report of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
President Ellis E. McCune, California State University, Hayward
- Report of the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges
Joyce Payne, Director, OAPBC
- Amendments to AASCU Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws
- Special Recommendation for Public Relations Campaign for State Colleges and Universities
President George Ayers, Chicago State University (IL)
- Actions and Resolutions
- Report of the Chairman of the Nominating Committee
President George E. Ayers, Chicago State University (IL)
- Election of Officers and Directors
- Election of 1986 Nominating Committee
- New Business

G. Theodore Mitau Award Presentation
6:30 p.m.-7:30 p.m.

Annual Awards Banquet
7:30 p.m.
"Presentation of the AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Awards"

Videotape Presentation
Introduction: President John L. Green, Jr., Washburn University of Topeka (KS)
Presentation: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi
Recipient: The Honorable Robert Dole, U.S. Senator, Kansas; Washburn University of Topeka (KS)

Introduction: President John Worthen, Ball State University (IN)
Presentation: President Aubrey K. Lucas, University of Southern Mississippi
Recipient: Jim Davis, Cartoonist, Ball State University (IN)

Meeting of the Board of Directors
10:30 p.m.
Chair: President Stephen Horn, California State University, Long Beach

General Session Addresses

Retrospect and Prospect

Harlan Cleveland
Dean
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

Retrospect and prospect--plenty of reason for what the mathematicians among you might call "solution space." Whether I look backward or forward, I see a fantastic growth in our capacity to understand complexity, handle complexity, manage complexity, even come to love complexity. E. B. White once said, "Have you considered how complicated things can get what with one thing leading to another."

I'm not here to celebrate my own specialty; I am indeed an escapee from political science and prefer the tag "generalist"--a member of the get-it-all-together profession, one of that growing crowd of Americans (I've been counting them, and I count more than a million, including you) whose primary vocation is to bring people in organizations together to make something different happen.

The practitioners and observers of politics may once again be the last to catch up with the macrotransition in which we find ourselves. "Politics," said Groucho Marx, "is the art of looking for trouble, finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and applying the wrong remedies." Sociologist William Simon wrote not long ago about "seventeenth and eighteenth-century personalities using twentieth-century communications systems, contesting for control of a nineteenth-century political system that will make decisions regarding the twenty-first century."

But we who presume to educate the young and reeducate the not-so-young should be way ahead of the publicity heroes and heroines. In my last visit with you in 1979, I agreed about how and why the general public nearly always seems to make policy before the people with fancy titles and loud voices (the people *People* magazine thinks are our leaders) announce it. But the policy makers are just grown-up schoolchildren, and many are looking for guidance in public colleges and universities before they reach for the reins of our dynamic democracy. If we aren't looking hard at the macrotransition we are in, they may be crippled for life with too much "retrospect" and not enough "prospect."

We can probably take as common ground the size, scope, and pace of the macrotransition--the historic change--that has already started. The French call it "l'informatization de la societe"--the informatization of society.

What's important is not only the computerization of society, impressive as that already is, but something more impressive--namely, the fusion of computers with telecommunications. In the fourteen years from

1946 to 1960, we went from having no computers to having 10,000. In the next twenty years (1960 to 1980), we went from 10,000 to 10,000,000--a thousandfold increase. The cost effectiveness of computers has increased 1,000 times in thirty years--a factor of ten per decade, compounded.

So far, most of the raw material for all this computation power has focused on words and numbers. It has made writing different--in my own experience, better. It has enabled us to model complex decisions and complex mechanisms, even begin in atmospheric and space science to simulate the unimaginable complexity of the real sky. In *Science* magazine earlier this year, an author described "a typical experiment" wherein the unknowns are 25,600 values of five physical variables at each of the 10,000 time steps. "The solution," he wrote, presumably with a smile, "is 1.25 billion numbers." But then he asks the right question: how to translate this hopeless pile of numbers into a recognizable science.

For most of us, who wouldn't know what to do with a Cray supercomputer if we had the $10,000,000 to buy one, the most striking change brought about by the computers alone is to add to writing, speech and visual expression a fourth mode of information--what Doug van Howling at the University of Michigan calls "algorithmic information." That's what enables you to work out a routine way for doing automatically what you used to do unautomatically. Nowadays we see this in microwave ovens, in statistical packages, in expert systems of all kinds, and, eventually, in some form of artificial intelligence. We see the same push toward algorithmic information. The computer is basically stupid; it can count from 0 to 1 and back, very fast, of course. But it does leave the interesting work to people--including dealing with other people.

But to my way of thinking, it isn't just the power of the computer that makes the 1980s one of the greatest watersheds in human history. It's the marriage of microprocessing to telecommunications, the explosive fusion of Babbage and Marconi and their successors, that has my head in a whirl, that calls into question most of the assumptions I derived from schooling and from experiences--and that is transforming our society (and the world of which we're more and more a part) in fundamental ways.

The beginning of wisdom now is to think of information as a resource. A century ago fewer than 10 percent of the American labor force did what we would now call information work. Now as many as 50-60 percent may be engaged in it.

The actual production, extraction, and growing of things--manufacturing and agriculture--now occupy less than a quarter of our human resources. Of all the rest--once lumped together under "service workers"--perhaps two-thirds are information workers. Peter Drucker, our best-known business philosopher, says that knowledge is "the central capital, the cost center, and the crucial resource of the economy." An OED study now reports that a similar trend makes information processing

a third or more of every industrial country's labor force; the figure for France is 46 percent--close to the estimate for the United States.

What is also new in consequence is a theory crisis, a sudden sense of having just run out of basic assumptions. We have carried over into our thinking about information (which is to say, symbols) concepts developed for the management of things--concepts such as property, depletion, depreciation, monopoly, market economics, class struggle, and top-down leadership. But as Nora and Minc say in their report to the President of France, "Both the liberal and Marxist approaches, contemporaries of the production-based society, are rendered questionable by its demise." The inherited assumptions are not producing satisfactory growth with acceptable equity either in the capitalist West or in the Socialist East. So I've come to believe that it would help if we both stopped treating information as just another thing and looked harder at what makes it so special.

This increasingly dominant resource is very different from the physical things we learned in school to think of as "resources."

Information isn't necessarily depletive--indeed, it's expandable. Much information grows with use. Whole industries (advertising, public relations, stockbroking, banking, insurance), and organized religion and government, too, bear witness that getting the word around enhances the word's value.

Information is compressible--not only mechanically, in the sense that you can miniaturize the information machines--but even more important, metaphorically, by the use of analogies or formulas or programs or even single words with enormous connotations, such as what the word *freeze* has become in the nuclear debate, or just a few letters like $E=mc^2$.

Information is highly transportable--at nearly the speed of light. No rails, roads, or airports are needed--just an allocated slice of the frequency spectrum, a few orbiting satellites, and a local telephone system that works.

Information is diffusive. It tends to leak, and in leaking multiplies: the more it leaks, the more we have, as the CIA is finding out. Like a virus (which is itself a tiny information system), knowledge tries to affect organisms around it, whether by over-the-fence gossip or by satellite broadcasting. The straitjackets of government secrecy intellectual property rights, and confidentiality of all kinds fit loosely on this restless resource.

And information is sharable. It doesn't give rise to exchange transactions, but to sharing transactions. It can't be sold or given away. Things are exchanged: if I give you a flower or sell you my automobile, you have it and I don't. But if I give you a fact or sell you an idea, we both have it.

The current "discovery" of information as a resource doesn't resolve the ancient puzzles about human rights and responsibilities, man and nature, liberty and authority, productivity and fairness,

protection of the common good in a world of individuals (and vice versa), protection of the global commons in a world full of nation-states. But the new information environment does change the context in which these durable dilemmas present themselves in the 1980s and 1990s. And the impact on every subject, every field, every discipline, is likely to be enormous and elemental.

Economics has to be much more than the science of the allocation of scarcities if the crucial resource of the economy is "in chronic surplus." That's how it's characterized by Lewis Branscomb, chief scientist of IBM. The accounting profession is going to have to rethink the concept of "depreciation" if the largest part of GNP isn't depletive, doesn't depreciate with use. The notion of information as property, deeply embedded into laws about copyright, patents, privacy, and government secrecy, is already eroding fast as xerography and tape recording cater to this leaky, "sharing" resource. If the validity of your action depends on its secrecy, you'd better do something else.

One kind of rethinking is especially ripe for attention wherever remoteness caused by physical distance has always been the fundamental fact of life. Communication satellites and fast computers are gradually erasing distance, eroding the idea that some places are world centers because they are near other places and other areas are bound to be peripheral because they are remote from the centers.

And in education, doesn't the new information environment place a much higher premium on integrative thought? Aren't we going to have to teach every subject in global perspective? Aren't we going to have to take a new look at a system that awards the highest credentials for wisdom to those with the narrowest command of knowledge?

Look, from where you sit, at the implications of the informatization of society. Let's suppose the old college library finally has to be torn down, and you're trying to figure out what the library of the future should be like. You've asked me in as a consultant. As a good consultant, I won't give you the answer, but I'll raise some questions. I'll mention some ancient and honorable tensions, each of which is exacerbated by what computers and telecommunications--live-in roommates now--are doing to us and can do for us. Here, as a start, are six of these deep dilemmas:

1. There is tension between preserving and making available. Most libraries and librarians haven't been as much like squirrels as the quartermasters during the second world war were said to be when they had the apocryphal slogan, "Property is issued in order that a proper record may be kept thereof." The mystique of libraries was that you had the books. And indeed I'd be willing to bet that half of your catalogs mention with pride the number of books in your library. (Or, if you don't have notebooks, you don't mention it.) But there is an increasing problem about the relationship between books and all the other media of communication. There is also an increasing problem about the copyright of what you already have and of who owns it. It's clear

that the effect of the informatization of society is going to be a leaning heavily toward the making-available side. What does that do to your library function?

2. There is the related tension between the ease of editing and the need for a definitive archive. When you've got something in a computer, as you know if you use a word processor, the temptation is to keep fiddling with it because it's so easy to revise and the revision comes out immediately in the new form. So when is it finished? That answer may become more and more difficult. When do you throw it away? The National Library of Medicine, one of the first computerized libraries, has had a principle that anything in a journal over fifteen years old gets eliminated from the system. If the information became available in a book, they are willing to keep the book.

3. There is the familiar tension between disciplines and integrative thought and, here again, I think the tilt produced by informatization is obvious. But still there is no category, for example, for this new book of mine in a bookstore or even in the publisher's mind. So it comes out as a business book because the cover says the word "executive." You are all executives, too, but the publisher is not thinking about that. There is no category for a book addressed to generalists. If you play around with accessing data bases, it's difficult to find key words like "ethics," "policy," "transnational," "movement," "leadership," "consensus," and "matrix." Those aren't the kinds of words in the minds of the people programming the data bases. What's in their minds is the vertical cylinders into which we have piled knowledge. I don't knock the system: it produced the scientific and industrial revolution. But it's time now for equal attention to the horizonal approach.

4. There's the tension between location and function. Is the standard measure, the number of books, valid any more? Does the library have to be nearby? Does your new library have to be as large? Is the librarian the guardian of a collection under one roof, or is the librarian of the future a *guide*--to data bases from Toronto to Tokyo, a guide who can tell me while I sit at my home computer that I can find what I'm looking for in a data base in Stockholm? Do I have to go to the libary at all? In the future, will the library make house calls, perhaps electronically?

5. Fifth is the tension bewteen systematic thought and leaps of intuition, between looking for what you know you want and browsing to figure out what you want to know. Will it become harder to browse in the electronic age, to graze on the open information meadow instead of feeding off the collection that happens to be housed in the library? "The real joy of scholarly research," an Arlington school teacher was quoted in *Time* magazine, "is discovering something valuable in the process of looking for something else." And key words in this case are useful only to the extent that the outputter thinks as an inputter. And that is very often not the case. So the informatization of society may

be an obstacle to the leaps of intuition that are the product of browsing, and we need to design our way around that obstacle.

6. Finally, there is the tension between the existence of information and access to it. An ecologist taught us that flood can be just as damaging as drought, and certainly we all know from our own experience that our main problem with information is not access but selection. It's what to do with that enormous incoming flood. Will information, which is inherently a more accessible resource than any previously dominant in world history, prove to be the great leveler, the instrument for fairness, or will "them that has, gets"? Will those who already have wealth and power be able to arrogate the new resource to their benefit? My guess is that the accessiblity of information will help advance fairness in the world, but in the information society, as in its predecessors, there's no free lunch. You've got to work at it. That work is getting all of your people educated, as the Japanese, South Koreans, and others have demonstrated.

Will the accessibility of information spoil totalitarianism? When I read in the paper the other day that the Russians had decided that they would admit personal computers for the first time, I said to myself, I'm reading a watershed newstory. There is a story they tell in West Germany in television circles about Dresden. Dresden, for topographical rather than political reasons, was having great difficulty getting a proper signal from West German television. This was proving to be a disadvantage to the people of Dresden in comparison with other East Germans. So whenever there was a big event, people would stream out on energy-guzzling missions to go someplace where they could get a decent signal for a television set. People were beginning to stop taking jobs in Dresden because of this deprivation. The East Germans inventoried all their usual, repressive solution strategies and found none of them satisfactory. Finally they built a big tower over the transponder and beamed the West German signal into Dresden, thereby creating fairness for the Dresdeners.

I want to mention just two other effects of the information revolution that seem to me to require new dimensions in our thinking, our premises, and our angles of vision. One is the blurring of the line between public and private. I'm struck by the fact that the idea of ownership, the future disappearance of the idea of ownership of a dominant resource, has to mean that the basis for the distinction between what's public and private in our society, in our mixed economy, is also likely to disappear or at least weaken. Both capitalist and socialist thinkers caught in their common nineteenth-century doctrine that ownership is the key to industrial success are obstacles now to the rethinking that might explain the huge success of systems that are neither private enterprise nor public enterprise, but a combination of both. If being in a public institution makes you think it all has to be done in the public sector, that's going to get in your way. The pervasive mixture of public and private enterprise means that the most

effective public servants are going to be those that best understand the mix and know how to mobilize private interests in the public interest. And the reverse is equally true. The most effective executives in the private sector will be those who best understand that government is the unavoidable and usually indispensable partner in anything really important they try to do. I think it's a fundamental issue for people like you and me to think about in our own context, and I particularly commend to you a speech Clifton Wharton, chancellor of the State University of New York, gave recently about what he called the "three R's" of the public/private partnership: renewal, retraining, and research.

How can public colleges and universities adjust to the disappearance of this line between public and private that has been fundamental to their past origins and their current identities? Each of you, with AASCU's creative help as always, is going to have to answer that question in ways that reflect the diversity of your missions and your constituencies. But the emerging relationship is going to be a mixture, and the people on both sides of that partnership who resist that conclusion are going to find themselves in a growing amount of conceptual trouble dealing day to day with the problems on their desks.

Now that so many processes of decision and action once held to comparatively few chests are opening to so many so much participation, there is a new problem for executives somewhat near the center of their moral and ethical dilemmas. It's *moral* responsibility for what happens. Now you would think it would happen that we executives would be relieved of our responsibilities for the general outcomes because the decisions are so widely spread. When only the king and his courtiers were in the know, the peasants and tradesmen outside the castle gates at least had the luxury (they had few others) of believing that if something went wrong, it was clearly "they"--those people up in the castle--who were at fault. But when discussions are widely debated in an open society and then turn out badly, something like a no-fault principle applies. "'They' are 'us,'" as Pogo says, and the blame rains on everybody. Only it doesn't work that way, does it?

When I was a university president I read a lot of literature on the presidency, and most said power was leaking out of the hands of the university president. I found that, indeed, the consultation systems made decision making pretty complicated in times of tranquility. As soon as the slightest hint of crisis arose, no line formed at my door to help me solve it. I knew then that the way to have power was to have a crisis going on all the time.

Now, we academic executives are still presumed, and are indeed presuming, to worry about the general outcome, about what it all means and why. Therefore, we who are the targets of this presumption need to think hard and straight about the responsibility that comes with the power knowledge brings.

Our lives, our courts, our media are crammed with incidents wherein we simply assume that responsiblitiy resides in knowledge and that people will be adept at avoiding it. What Hubert Humphrey once said of his own profession applies to them all: "We believe that to err is human. To blame it on someone else is politics."

If you see someone about to commit suicide, you feel a responsibility (to act or not to act) that isn't shared with those lacking access to your knowledge. Not long ago, a woman whose bone marrow might save a particular life was not told so by the hospital, which thought it unfair to burden her with the responsibility such knowledge would entail. You and I don't feel responsible for the rape of that young woman on a pool table in a New Bedford bar, but the bartender and others who watched and didn't intervene we regard as responsible.

Those who possess and manage nuclear weapons, and those who have looked hard at the effects, are bound to feel a special responsibility to avoid their use. That is, I believe, why the third atomic bomb has not yet been dropped.

The responsibility that resides in knowledge produces a tension between two very human aspirations--the need to know and the need not to know. Both aspirations are especially functional in the information society. Both are also readily corruptible.

Open systems founded on persuasion and consensus require many people to know a lot and to provide feedback as an expression of the responsibliity that knowledge makes mandatory. If people know how a system works, they can make it work for them. Knowledge is the key to getting what you want--from parents, from employees, from government, from social security, from life. Knowledge is the key to productivity and to participation.

The catch is that the decision about who needs to know rests with those who already know. If letting others in on the secret may lead them to frustrate your ambition in some way, you're going to be tempted to decide they have no need to know. Many is the time that the President of the United States has enveloped his actions in a cloak of "national security" to prevent their being debated in Congress. In national security matters our constitutional separation of powers, Joe Califano once said, is the separation of Congress from the power to make policy.

The need not to know is also functional. If you try to know everything, as Rabelais said he tried to do four centuries ago, you would choke on the impact of the input and achieve no output. All of us have to screen out of our minds and memories most of the information that comes to us through the mail and the media. That's the only way we can cope with information overload.

We all know people who ignore plain facts readily available to them. The people who nurse strategic missiles, or who examine our hand luggage at the airport, badly need *not* to now how extrememly unlikely is the contingency against which they are preparing.

Avoidance of knowledge is often a cop-out. In old China no one wanted to touch a dead body because if you did, social custom made you responsible for the funeral. How many people on the fringes of the Watergate scandal said to themselves and to their spouses, "I don't want to know what the money is being spent on."

The antidote to both kinds of restraints on knowledge--the narrowing of the "need to know" circle and the too-easy resorting to deliberate ignorance--is openness, but not always more openness all the time (not everybody participating in everything). Aristotle was right in warning against carrying any principle to its ultimate logic. But, usually, two heads are better than one and three heads are better than two. And so on for a while.

In our changing, information-rich environment, openness much more often than not makes the best policy because it brings into consultation people (or groups or nations) who have to agree on a plan of action if they are expected to carry it out. In this sense, openness (not as an ideological preference, but as a technological imperative) is good for us--if we educate ourselves to use the opportunities it opens up.

If knowledge is power, knowledge is also responsibility for its exercise. We are living in these hierarchies we've inherited from the "things" era: hierarchies of control, secrecy, privilege, ownership, geography. It's the twilight of hierarchy now. It's rethinking time. We're living in this big wooden mansion, still only faintly aware that the termites are working into the wood. One of these days, we'll lean on one of those solid-looking pillars, and it will collapse under the weight of obsolete assumptions--unless we do our rethinking first.

The Federal Role in Higher Education

The Honorable E. Thomas Coleman (R-MO)
Ranking Minority Member
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

When I leave the warm atmosphere of Miami later to go to St. Joseph's and speak to the Rotary Club, I think it will be a little cooler, and the introduction may be a little different. You know, those of us in public life, at least in our home districts, would like always to be introduced as "a man who needs no introduction, your congressman." At least, that's our effort--to make ourselves a household word. Obviously, when you are introduced at a convention or a group such as this, it's a little different. I'll always be hoping for that same introduction back home--you really have to work for it.

You never know if you are getting through to the general public. The other day I was grocery shopping in St. Joseph, my home district, and saw a couple of ladies. I didn't pay much attention to them and went about my business. When I saw the same two ladies a little later, after I went down one aisle and the next, they were whispering and looking over toward to me and pointing in my direction. I thought I'd go over and say hello to them, really make their day, so I walked over and said, "Guess you know who I am." One said, "No, but you've got our shopping cart."

It's with trepidation that I speak to a room full of college presidents--all experts in this field. I feel like one of my congressional colleagues who would continuously go home to his district and talk about the important problems and issues facing the nation and the world, but when asked about them, had no solutions. It got rather embarrassing after awhile. He finally sought the assistance of one of the local ministers, saying, "Reverend, I need some help, I need some answers. I need revelations on big issues like the budget deficit, national defense, international affairs." And the minister said, "Well, next time it rains, go outside and look up into the sky, and I think you'll get a revelation." So the congressman did, and when he saw the minister on the street the next morning, he said, "You know that storm that went through last night? I did exactly what you told me. I went outside and looked up to the heavens. I got a lot of water in my face and rain down my neck, and felt like a damn fool." The minister said, "Not bad for the first revelation." I don't know if that's how you'll be feeling about me when I finish this morning, but I'm happy to be here and participate with this panel and perhaps answer questions after I'm through.

We've had a lot of hearings and heard a lot of witnesses, and it's appropriate that your motto at this particular meeting, your twenty-fifth, is to look backward and forward. This month marks the twentieth

anniversary, which we just celebrated, of the signing of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by Lyndon Johnson. Twenty years ago a federal commitment was first put in place for higher education. That commitment consisted of grants, work study, and loan opportunities for college students to attend the institutions of their choice and also to provide the resources that make America's college system, we hope, the best in the world.

While we all recognize the twentieth anniversary of the Higher Education Act, we probably aren't celebrating the fact that nineteen years ago this month I got my first college loan and was one of the beneficiaries of these programs. That's why I believe in them. That's why I believe it's important for us to offer opportunities for people to get an education who are financially unable to do so on their own. Unlike David Stockman, I want to make the record clear: I paid back my loans.

The federal role the past twenty years in higher education has revolved around four major themes. Those themes are familiar to those in higher education, but I think it's important to reemphasize them, including how and why and what we did, in 1985. First, we have the issue of equal educational opportunity and access for low- and middle-income students. Second, we have allowed the students a choice among various postsecondary institutions, to give them the opportunity to go to school where they would like to go, based on the curriculum offered, on what they would like to do with their life, and the obvious cost differences between institutions. Third, we have incorporated the concept of diversity among America's postsecondary institutions to allow student participation in all forms of higher education. Fourth, we want to meet certain educational needs through a number of categorical programs, targeted to such areas as library services, international education, and continuing education, just to name a few. Over the last twenty years, the Higher Education Act has become the vehicle for many new initiatives in higher education.

Of course, AASCU has played a leading role in initiatives and changes throughout the years, and I am glad to be able to address this group and talk about some of them.

The student aid programs have been dramatically expanded from twenty years ago to include Pell grants, the SSIG, Student Loan Marketing Association, the secondary marketing for student loans. Programs were designed to help students overcome nonfederal barriers to education, such as lack of information. The original talent search program has now developed into a series of five different programs. Only in Washington would you have five programs be called a "trio," but that's the case. Other new federal programs have evolved to support higher education, such as graduate fellowships and cooperative education, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the law school clinical experience program, all of which have found a "home" in the Higher Education Act. Over the past twenty years, programs contained in the

original Act have undergone substantial changes through four comprehensive reauthorizations.

When I ran for Congress the first time, in 1976, one of the things candidates always assumed was that programs in Washington, once instituted, continue forever without anyone ever reviewing them. For some reason we believed that, but when I got to Washington and into Congress, I found out that programs can expire if Congress doesn't renew them, and they can have set provisions, and there can be reauthorizations of various acts--such as the Higher Education Act. There have been four reauthorizations in the last twenty years. I've been able to participate in two now. I think it's good to allow authorizations to expire because it requires Congress to examine the content of the legislation and see what changes have occurred to make sure that the programs are actually being administered and the recipients are actually the ones we want targeted.

During the period covered by these four comprehensive reauthorizations, we have seen a number of changes. For example, the GSL program has evolved into a variable-rate instrument that is now attractive to lenders. We have witnessed the creation of a national secondary market--Sallie Mae. The federal government was once the main provider of default insurance; this is now handled by guarantee agencies. The requirements for educational opportunity grants have changed.

Most important has been the shift in emphasis from objects to people. (The original 1965 Act supported such things as books and buildings but little in terms of student aid.) In that first reauthorization of $1.1 billion, 68 percent of the funds were used for institutional aid programs. Now under the 1986 authorization, these programs amount to almost $12 billion. The growth has been amazing. We now have 90 percent of the funds devoted to student assistance and only 10 percent to institutional aid. This shift in priorities occurred in 1972 when a difference between the House and the Senate developed and a conference committee adopted the version that provides the basic opportunity grants (Pell).

Finally, we see throughout the twenty years--and I want to emphasize this--a bipartisan commitment to higher education--bipartisan among the presidents who have occupied the White House during those twenty years, and bipartisan on Capitol Hill, where I have had the opportunity to serve with two chairmen of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, during my tenure on the House Education Committee.

Paul Simon was our chairman for a number of years before he was elected to the Senate. He and I had a good relationship and were able to accomplish a great deal. Bill Ford, who has extensive experience in higher education, having been in Congress for those full twenty years and been part of the original authorization and the writing of the Act, is now our chairman. Mr. Ford brings with him a great amount of information and talent. We have been able to create a fine working relationship between the Republicans and the Democrats so that we ended up

passing HR 3700, which is our new reauthorization act, with only two dissenting votes as it passed out of committee just a week or two ago.

All of us worked toward making sure that higher education does not become a partisan football in the very partisan atmosphere of Washington, D.C. As we address the Higher Education Act, I'd like to discuss something that affects the atmosphere in which we have to conduct ourselves. It is something that was not really with us twenty years ago when this Act was first passed: budget considerations.

Everything we do in Congress is colored to one extent or another by the deficit and budget issue. We have almost a $200-billion deficit. We cannot afford to increase programs helter-skelter. We cannot afford new programs, and from that standpoint we have to reduce the size of the deficit to make our economy strong and be able to continue recovery, which has come to many parts of this nation.

We have set budget goals in Congress for fiscal 1986. These goals are in the form of a budget resolution: it's nothing more than a piece of paper. Nobody goes to jail if we don't follow it. If that were the case, 435 members of the House would be out on parole; we're not. We simply passed an act back in 1974 that said we shall have a budget resolution by a certain date. That really fixes the framework and the parameters of the discussion of legislation for the rest of the fiscal year. In the budget process we adopt figures and then have to go back and substantively change or pass legislation that reconciles those figures to real-life programs. It's much easier to pass budgets than it is to pass reconcilation bills because they involve real dollars.

In higher education we've had to find $800 million of savings before we could even begin to address reauthorization. In the House and Senate, the budget has permitted inflation for increases for most of the programs. In fact, if you look at the entire budget, higher education probably did better than any other sector--even defense. That having been said, we still have to save $800 million.

We made our savings in the GSL program. We have our own ideas in the House. We require the state guaranteeing agencies to return $50 million in advance funds. We enacted an across-the-board needs analysis to determine GSL eligibility--that saves money. We require lenders to make mandatory multiple dispersements; this is also in our higher education reauthorization. We enacted a series of amendments designed to prevent defaults and improve collections, which I am proud to have authored.

The Senate package contained some similar and some different reconciliation proposals. It reduces lender profits by reducing the special allowance from 3.5 to 3.25. It enacts programs of loan consolidation. It requires lenders to make mandatory multiple dispersments as well. It requires the state guarantee agencies to send back $75 million, not the $50 million we required. It enacted a series of amendments similar to my bill in the House reducing defaults and improving collections. And it requires Sallie Mae to return $30 million in federal financing advanced to them to start up the corporation.

The reconcilation process continues. We still have to hear from the conferees and pass some sort of reconciliation bill. Now if I've lost you so far, you'll certainly be lost when I mention Gramm-Rudman. We have a new concept, a concept floated by Senator Gramm of Texas and Senator Rudman of New Hampshire in which they try again to reduce the $200-billion deficit down to $0 by 1991 through reductions of a certain amount each year. (I think it amounts to about $36 billion a year to reach a zero deficit.)

There is nothing magic about balanced budget amendments. It's always easier to talk about generality than to act. This is another example of Congress's coming up with strategy that won't pay off until later on--"later on" meaning we can all stand around and say, "I didn't do that!" What Gramm-Rudman does is change almost in a revolutionary form the budget process and its impact on higher education. It says that the House and Senate must agree to automatic reductions of $36 billion or so a year. If they cannot, through specific programs, then the President, with the stroke of a pen across the board, generates those savings--and I mean across the board: defense, education, farm programs, space programs, whatever. This will ensure a balanced budget and is perhaps the only way to reduce the deficit, but it's the old meat-axe approach. It doesn't take into consideration the nation's priorities, and the differences among the programs and people they serve. So who knows what Gramm-Rudman will bring to higher education and other programs. I mention it because it is looking over our shoulder as we redraft the Higher Education Act.

Under Gramm-Rudman in the House and Senate bills, cuts are made in the GSL programs based on cuts in special allowances as well as an increase in the loan origination fee paid by students. The conference committee is presently meeting on Gramm-Rudman, an important process, and the legislation will pass in one form or another. It is tied to the debt ceiling of the United States, which means that every time we go above the current ceiling, we have to authorize a higher one, or else every check in the nation bounces, or every bond in the nation is not backed up by the full faith and credit of the United States Government. Nobody will allow that to happen, and this is the bill to which it's tied, so it will pass in one form or another.

Let me talk a little bit about HR 3700, the reauthorization act. Bill Ford waited until an even number came through the hopper and then threw in our bill--3700--a very easy number to remember. HR 3700 is the result of bipartisan effort from the House Committee on Education and Labor. Our subscommittee on postsecondary education had thirty-six hearings on reauthorization throughout the nation. Almost a year ago Bill Ford and I sent out a letter to 140 various associations, including AASCU, asking for views on what should be included in the legislation. We received 104 responses, and the staff went to work putting together various side-by-side proposals and drafting a committee print to serve as a vehicle allowing us to discuss the issues.

We started out with a committee list drafted by Bill Ford. We offered sixty different amendments to this draft and on November 6 completed our work in the subcommittee. The bill was introduced, and on November 12, the full Education Committee met and passed HR 3700. The bill was sent to the floor via the rules committee, where we obtained a ruling. We are now scheduled to go to the Floor.

In developing HR 3700, we tried to identify the trends that have been occurring in higher education. Over the last twenty years, when we've had federal commitment to students in this country, we have seen 80 percent of the support for financial assistance come from the federal government. At the same time, we've seen decreases in the real effect of these resources. In academic year 1984-85 we had about $18 billion from all sources--federal, state, and institutional--about the same as in 1981-82. But if you factor in cost-of-living increases and especially the cost of attending various institutions, you will find that we've really lost ground for the average family whose income has only kept pace with the inflation of almost 15 percent over those years. It has become more difficult for families and individuals to finance a college education.

We spotted another trend that emerged in the late 1970s: the emphasis of loans over grants. This is a bothersome condition but understandable as well. Back in 1975-76, 80 percent of student aid assistance was in grant aid, and that was the high water mark. Now in this past year, 46 percent of all assistance was in grants. Obviously the primary beneficiary of this change has been the GSL program, which has grown tremendously. We are concerned about this because of the shift but also because grant aid has been the underlying reason that many disadvantaged and minority students can go to college. We recognize that this has been their access ticket. At the same time, we have seen a number of students frightened by the large amounts of loans they would incur by going to school. We see a higher default rate because people are carrying larger loan debts after they graduate. And a lot of people are saying, "I've got this heavy loan around my neck I have to pay off" and may therefore pursue certain careers not by choice but because of financial necessity. As a result, we may be influencing people's lifestyles and futures by the amount of college loan debt we allow them to incur.

We also see another change in higher education: a new kind of student. No longer is it the 18-22-year old who is the traditional student. Part-time students are the fastest growing sector of higher education. Almost 5 million Americans today are part-time students. One-third of the degrees this year will be awarded to students over twenty-five years of age. We tried to recognize that trend as we developed reauthorization. We want to make sure that independent adults are not discriminated against and that we do not exclude people from aid because they may be older and attending class on less than a full-time basis.

In the interest of time I will not go through every paragraph and section of the bill. But I do have a few highlights I'd like to pass on to stimulate discussion and comments. HR 3700 as drafted advances the goal of equal educational opportunity by improving the balance and equity of our student aid programs. It increases the maximum supplemental grant from $2,000 to $4,000. It increases the state student incentive grant award from $2,000 to $3,000. Of course, we have to deal with the issue of Pell grants. Every year a serious issue surrounds the Pell Grant formula, and this year was no exception. Bill Ford and I both tried to persuade the higher education community that to sit down and try to work out some compromise on maximum grant and percentage of cost to recommend for the bill. Time and time again we requested this, and finally with the leadership of AASCU and other Washington-based associations, a compromise was drafted, raising the maximum Pell grant award to $2,300 with a $200 increase every year and a 60-percent cost-of-attendance figure. This will not change the percentage distribution of these funds between public and private institutions; it will continue at the current 62/38 percentages.

We require SEOGs to be targeted to students from low- and moderate-income families. We require that students establish their eligibility, or indeed their ineligibility, for Pell grants before going to the borrowing window for the various loan programs. We provide for only modest increases in the loan limits. We continue the $2,500 for the first two years and increase it to $5,000 for the last two undergraduate years.

We do have several cost-saving measures involved. Again, because of the budget and deficit, because of all the requirements demanding us to live within our means, we've had to have some way of dealing with the cost factors. We've designed program costs and tried to keep them from using up dollars for students. We've limited program eligibility to those who show financial need, and we've instituted across-the-board needs analysis. We require the multiple dispersement of loans.

We recalled guarantee agency advances, to begin in 1988. We increased borrower interest payback from 8-10 percent after the fourth year and during the fifth year of repayment on GSL. We have a loan consolidation program that will help former students ease the burden of large loan debts by consolidation and an opportunity to stretch out payments over a longer period of time and reduce the monthly burdens. This, in turn, should decrease the default rate and increase the resources available for current students. We also have established incentives for loan guarantee agencies to make additional efforts to collect delinquent loans.

HR 3700 also addresses the goal of equal educational opportunity by trying to make fair the actual appraisal of financial resources available to individual families. We think we have done so; we hope so. We have tried to recognize the nontraditional student. These students--the worker changing careers, the displaced homemaker, the veteran, the

adult seeking additional enrichment or career advancement--are all rapidly becoming the new majority of postsecondary education, and we have tried to address that in our work. Under HR 3700, for example, incomes of independent students will be addressed and treated in the same way as incomes of families with dependent students for purposes of determining eligibility for student aid. I think that is very important. In addition we establish eligibility for student assistance except for the GSL program for less than half-time students, again recognizing the phenomenon of part-time students now becoming the majority students. We have a new program of special child-care services for disadvantaged adult students. We provide loan repayment deferments for up to six months for people who take parental leave.

We recognize that a family's principal place of residence is an asset that comes under tremendous stress and strain, especially for dislocated workers and dislocated homemakers. Therefore, we do not include the principal residence in the particular formulas involved. We have also considered, and have adjusted some formulas to reflect, farm country and the recession/depression occurring in rural America.

We make it easier for students and their families to understand and obtain help and information on educational assistance under the student aid program. We have a toll-free information number (one of a million in this country, but an important one, we think) for students to get information on student aid.

We're asking institutions to provide a printout as a kind of reminder that they have a stake in these various programs and to show exactly where their assistance came from--information to be detailed to the individual student and family.

We tried to speed up the process on Pell applications by allowing on-campus corrections of errors to be made during that process. At the same time we have tried to improve categorical assistance programs to meet the contemporary needs of higher education--for example, Title V, a midcareer teacher training program for nontraditional students and faculty members, Title VII, to increase the capital available for building and renovating academic facilites, and Title IX, a proposal I introduced, which tries to identify underrepresented groups in graduate schools as well as provide some assistance and grants in areas of critical need in our graduate departments across the country.

You might say this is a full platter, and indeed it is. But I'm optimistic that we're going to pass the Higher Education Act again even though we only have about twelve legislative days left this calendar year. We still have a tax bill that you've read about; we still have the budget that I've told you about; we still have the Gramm-Rudman debt ceiling that we've talked about; and we may have some farm credit issues that I'll talk about when I get home; but the Act will be on the schedule, I think, and one of the most important things that this Congress can identify and address. I've said all along that the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is probably the Number One

piece of social legislation we will pass this year. I am proud to have played a leading role in the formulation of this Act, working with Bill Ford and others on our committee. This is important legislation, and AASCU ought to be congratulated for its involvement. The process was a success because of organizations and associations such as yours, which had a comprehensive position, a rational and understandable position, which testified at many hearings, which made the points known to all of us, and ended up finally forging the compromises that were so important in making this piece of legislation receive a broad spectrum of support as it passed out of our education committee. So I congratulate all of you for not only twenty-five years of general service but for the very good service you've given the United States Congress. You've carried your views and your message to us in an important year.

International Address

USIA and Higher Education

Marvin Stone
Deputy Director
United States Information Agency

When I received AASCU's Distinguished Alumnus Award in 1977, one of the great honors of my life, I spoke about the conglomeration of media--journalism in chains. I bemoaned the concentration of media power, whether radio, television, newspapers, magazines, or books, in fewer and fewer hands. I saw the trend coming, but little did I know that my own magazine would become a victim. It convinced me that the time had come to retire after forty years in journalism, twenty-five of them with *U.S. News and World Report*. I thought it would be only fitting to go to work for the government. Inasmuch as I had had three organizations bought out from under me in my life, I figured that no one would take over the U.S. Government, which is operating with a two trillion-dollar deficit.

Government has been interesting. I don't entirely agree with former Senator Eugene McCarthy, who said, "Working for the bureaucracy is like being a football coach: you have to be smart enough to understand the game and dumb enough to think it's important." However, one other lesson I've learned during my short time in government is that any person hired by a bureaucracy to respond to complaints usually has no power to remedy them, so if you have any complaints about USIA, please direct them elsewhere!

Actually, I'm pleased to be able to give you a rather upbeat report today. Four or five years ago, some of you may have wondered how an administration vowing to reduce the size and costs of government would view educational exchanges between our country and those overseas. Was it a frill? Easy to cut? Possibly a worthwhile activity but one for the private sector? Or were educational exchanges going to become a blunt instrument of foreign policy and, therefore, dilute their academic integrity?

I'm happy to report that in spite of budget cutting elsewhere and pressures everywhere, educational exchanges are alive and well in Washington. In fact, exchange programs have been rescued from a serious decline, an erosion that until recently had lasted twenty years. The record shows that funding for exchanges has increased more rapidly under this administration than at any other time in the history of these programs. The figures are illuminating. USIA budget for cultural and educational exchanges, for the fiscal year that ended last September 30, was $140 million. That is a 105-percent increase over the 1981 level. This sum principally covers the Fulbright exchanges, our international visitors program (I'm delighted that some of our foreign visitors are here under that program today), the Hubert Humphrey

Fellowships, and what we call our private-sector programs. We hope to maintain and build on that growth of the last five years.

As significant as the growth in funds are the major new programs we've launched. They have resulted from a very hard, thoughtful look at the uses and benefits of exchanges in today's world. They involve many new groups of people: the young, the economically disadvantaged, the handicapped. Recent programs include the Central America Undergraduate Scholarhip Program (CAMPUS, as you know it), University Affiliation programs, the President's International Youth Exchange, and more recently, the Congress-Bundestag program.

All of this exchange activity springs from the concept originally embodied in the Fulbright program's authorizing legislation: the idea of mutual understanding. Looking out over the devastation of WWII, Senator Fulbright and other influential Americans reasoned that people and nations had to learn to think globally if the world is to survive. The Senator believed that if large numbers of people knew and understood those from nations other than their own, they might, in his words, "develop a capacity for empathy, a distaste for killing other men, and an inclination for peace." His thinking was sound.

Reluctant as postwar America was to assume the mantle of world leadership, there was no alternative. And for some years we, our old allies and new friends, had a relationship based on the postwar realities of reconstruction development and a bipolar great-power structure. They responded instinctively to American generosity and farsightedness. Unfortunately today, young people in Europe and elsewhere have precious little memory of America as a benevolent victor. They see a complex, bewildering world of contending super powers and of other competing power centers as well. They've grown accustomed to the free-wheeling social structure and relative prosperity into which they were born. And they take for granted the values their parents and grandparents struggled to defend. Like many of their American counterparts, they have turned inward, losing interest in other nations and cultures. Moreover, in the 1960s and '70s, even as international economic and political interdependence grew, educational exchange opportunities for young people and scholars greatly declined. USIA is seeking to rectify this problem.

In 1982, President Reagan announced his youth exchange initiative to increase the number of 15-19-year olds experiencing life in other nations. First it involved the United States, a few European allies, Canada, and Japan. More recently it has grown to include thirty nations around the world. At the end of this three-year effort, we expect that more than 23,000 young people will have participated.

Another program is the Congress-Bundestag program, a full scholarship program for German and American youth funded by both governments. It has just entered its second year. Selected through local competition, a thousand German and American young people are spending this

school year in each other's countries, living with host families and attending secondary schools.

Another new program with which you may be more familiar, the Central American Undergraduate Scholarship Program (CAMPUS), grew out of the 1984 Kissinger Commission recommendations and out of our concern about the recent dramatic rise in undergraduate scholarship activity in Central America. More than 3,000 Central American students--a 5-1/2-fold increase in five years--are in the Soviet Union today for long-term academic training, with many hundreds, possibly thousands, more in Cuba and Eastern Europe. Government and academic leaders in Central America properly express alarm over this development, and one after another tell us that these young people would rather study in the West. Still it is the Soviet Union which right now is recruiting large numbers of bright young people who haven't the resources to pay for their own higher education. Students returning to Central America after a Soviet education are naturally grateful to Moscow, and as you know, their degrees are not readily recognized in Western-oriented institutions. And for this they blame our country and become alienated and anti-American. The upshot is that frequently the only work they can find is with university faculties in Central America, where there are severe shortages of trained academicians and where anti-Americanism flourishes. Over time these developments could dramatically alter the education and political destiny of Central America. We believe that Central American students should have opportunity for advanced education in this country and not have to look to communist countries for it. We want them to see what America is like from the inside, and we want to demonstrate our commitment to the future of democracy in their region. Together with the Agency for International Development (AID) we developed a plan to reach a goal of 10,000 scholarship and training awards for Central Americans by 1990. If fully funded by Congress, USIA's share would amount to almost 3,000 students a year, most of whom would be undergraduates.

We are starting our new campus program this year with a pilot project in which some of you are involved. Starting January 1986, 143 undergraduate students from nonelite economic backgrounds will study at American colleges for two years in areas of urgent need for their countries, such as health, engineering, and business management. In fact, 109 colleges applied to host these students, and I am pleased that of the twelve chosen to take part, AASCU schools are represented: Mankato State University (MN), University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and Murray State University (KY). I'd like to note that in 1980 Murray State established the Center for International Programs, which has done wonders working with affiliations in developing countries, bringing in the Fulbrighters. It's a model program for any schools interested in educational exchanges.

College students have been selected through a rigorous screening process in which the Institute for International Education (IIE) also

was involved. In addition, the Board of Foreign Scholarships reviewed the pilot program and approved the schools selected and approved each of the students selected. The interest in this program from AASCU and others in the U.S. academic community is gratifying. As the program grows--and we hope Congress will see to that--we will surely be getting more institutions involved.

Our flagship exchange effort, the Fulbright program, is preparing to celebrate its fortieth anniversary. More than 150,000 persons have won Fulbrights since 1946, including, I imagine, many of you in this audience. The program has inspired countless other public and private exchange initiatives. Until quite recently, however, the program's worldwide impact had been declining. During the period when the number of countries participating in the Fulbright program increased from twenty-seven to 120, funding for these exchanges judged in constant dollars dropped more than 57 percent. It is only in the last four years that we have reversed that trend, providing not only more money but greater prestige for the program.

Let me give you a few examples of how the Fulbright program is providing a wider range of opportunities to more Americans and foreign scholars than ever before. We have established the University Affiliation Program, which creates partnerships between U.S. and foreign colleges and universities through exchanges of faculty and staff. In its first four years the program has awarded 101 grants, sixty-five of them to AASCU colleges and universities. This year affiliation grants resulted in new links between American universities and universities in Ireland, Argentina, India, and South Korea, to name a few. We are drawing more and more American participants to the program with two new kinds of grants: collaborative research grants that fund joint research abroad by teams of two or three U.S. graduate students, and serial grants to permit a scholar who is not available for a full academic year to go abroad for several months a year for up to three consecutive years. We have expanded and improved exchanges with Eastern Europe, funding among other things a pilot project to provide language and area training for American lecturers. And of course last Thursday in Geneva a general exchange agreement was signed with the Soviet Union, which will restore the opportunity for greater exchanges with that country. Separate from that was the announcement of the President's initiative to broaden people-to-people exchanges with the Soviet Union (another program). The first will be executed by USIA, the second in conjunction with USIA but probably with a good bit of private-sector funding once it gets off the ground. And, finally, we've opened a Pacific Islands office in Honolulu, making the Fulbright and Humphrey fellowships available to ten island countries that were never before involved.

The Hubert Humphrey Fellowship Program is now in its seventh year, providing specially designed graduate-level training at American universities to midcareer professionals from developing countries. This

month I personally welcomed more Humphrey fellows than ever before--151 from seventy-five countries studying at fourteen universities in fields such as agriculture, public administration, and public health. I would hope that in future years I will see AASCU members among those schools.

Returning to my original question: Why is an Administration and a Congress struggling with the financial bottom line smiling so warmly on exchange programs? The evidence, small and large, says that exchanges work. We can count thousands, perhaps millions, of useful human educational bridges between the United States and other nations through exchange programs. Moreover, there are good educational reasons, human reasons and, in a broad sense, political reasons for the expansion of exchanges.

As for the educational reasons, sending four distinguished cardiologists to teach in Brazil and Argentina as we are will surely have a far-reaching educational benefit. Bringing twenty-one international scholars to Boston to familiarize them with new teaching methods and materials will also create many educational ripples. (You could list these better than I.)

The human case for exchange is perhaps the easiest to make. Living in another country usually produces a wonderful stretching of the mind. It makes one see the world through different eyes. It makes us do things in a different way and may even make us decide that this new way of seeing and doing makes its own good human sense. It also makes us deeply aware of our own culture, its strengths and idiosyncrasies. As we learned anew at USIA, opening our nation and our universities to people from abroad can have unexpected results. More than 100 middle-aged Japanese Fulbright alumni came to the United States at their own expense on what they called a sentimental journey. They came bearing gifts: $1.5 million they had raised to help bring more American Fulbrighters to Japan. One of these visitors who studied in the United States right after the war spoke for all when he said, "We from a former enemy country were warmly welcomed. A farm family accepted me like one of their own. We want people to know that we are still grateful."

Other good reasons for exchanges have to do with how we as people and as a nation are viewed in the world. In this we are often not starting with a clean page. Not only have American-made movies of violence, junk music, and Hollywood television given a distorted view of the United States to many, but other nations have worked to paint a false picture of us and our motives. America, it has been said, is not a country but an idea. And for many from abroad it is an idea that must be seen and felt to be understood. While we may not seek to convert others to our way of life, at least we want them to see us accurately, to get a true picture of our underlying strengths and values, to see that democracy does work and that it is worth nourishing anywhere in the world where it takes root. Exchanges again and again have enabled people to make up their own minds about America. And that is one more

reason it seems profoundly beneficial that since 1979 more than 20,000 students from another country, one with which we had no person-to-person contact for more than thirty years, have been studying at American universities. Many of you I know have been involved in our new exchange with the People's Republic of China.

USIA cares deeply about educational exchange programs. Of that let me give you my personal assurance. Five months at USIA has been long enough for me to understand how important it is to this agency. We may be able to get foreign students and scholars here, but without the excellence and diversity of America's colleges and universities there would be no reason for them to come. Through you, students from abroad not only get the incomparable benefits of an American education but also gain access to the cultural and human resources of your local communities.

I might add that you have another resource, one I hope you will not hesitate to use: the ability to tell the American public and political leaders how much exchanges mean to your institutions, to your communities, and to the nation. Exchanges do not have a large body of supporters in this country. It is up to those of us involved to encourage our fellow citizens to welcome exchange students; it is up to us to encourage the media to report on these programs; it is up to us to beseech our political leaders to support essential legislation to carry on these programs.

I would like to close with the words of the late E. B. White, a hero not only of former journalists but also of most educated Americans. He wrote, "To me, living in the light means an honest attempt to discover the germ of common cause in a world of special cause, even against the almost insuperable odds of parochialism and national fervor." For those of us jointly involved in our nation's educational exchanges, I hope we shall go on together living in the light.

President-to-Presidents Lecture

2010: The Next Twenty-Five Years

Kala M. Stroup
President
Murray State University (KY)

As we examine our future and review our origins, it becomes clear that as AASCU universities, we have a unique obligation to lead the way to a more meaningful public definition and debate about quality . . . and excellence.

To lead the way, we need to blend vision with reality. Let me begin by painting a picture.

Our AASCU universities are like a stained-glass window--bits and pieces held together by a structure that forms part of the image--diverse, multicolored, changing as a result of one's perspective. Its beauty is in its irregularity, its lack of standardization. When the sun shines through this stained-glass window, it shows a vision of splendor, a way the world would look if the sunny side of human nature could shine all the time--brilliant, multishaped, and multicolored. Its brilliance is in its respect for diversity, colors, and shapes. The *vision* is made of diverse, small, separate pieces that form a whole--more magnificent than any single piece. It seems to change in tones yet remains constant. When the storms form outside this window, there is still an enduring glow, a vision of hope and warmth. This window can withstand very rough weather--it endures. With severe abuse, this window can be shattered but rarely destroyed. Only its beauty and splendor can be distorted.

A university is as special as a stained-glass window, a brilliant composite--enduring, resilient, and strong . . . irregular shapes forming a whole. No other institution reflects more poignantly than our state universities the dreams and strivings, the visions, the achievements, and the dilemmas of our society.

Our institutions were developed to address *new* needs unmet by the missions and narrow curricula of the classical colleges, to provide access and opportunity at low cost, and to develop individuals without prevailing elitist barriers and values.

We were designed to meet the varied needs of the people in an ever-changing, ever-increasingly complex society . . . to bring educational opportunities to a wider range of people . . . to be *responsive* to changing needs . . . and to change tones with the change of light.

Our state colleges developed from academies, women's seminaries, public normal schools, military schools, technical institutes. They were colleges, schools, seminaries designed to meet educational needs of groups *excluded* from other forms of higher education and to meet the educational needs of a changing society for teachers and technicians.

Our universities, born to create opportunity, are in the eye of the storm over quality yet have the capacity to be even more brilliant in the year 2010.

The Future

The welfare of our country is tied inextricably to higher education institutions. Strong colleges and universities are central to the vigor of our nation economically, culturally, and spiritually. In an increasingly knowledge-based society, the importance of that relationship will only grow. Complex, technological societies need complex higher education resources.

Several guidelines[1] should be used in thinking about the next twenty-five years:

- Intelligence is/will be our basic capital/resource. Knowledge, information, new ideas, discoveries, deeper understandings, better facts are the basic capital--the fundamental requisite--as critical as land and oil. A knowledgeable people is now more important than any other indispensable resource for our country.
- We are moving toward mass, universal higher education. Today, 63 percent of high school seniors nationally go on to some form of post-secondary education.

We are going to need places to accommodate by the year 2010 approximately the same number of students as were enrolled in 1978.

- We are going to need institutions that are at least as *diverse* as we have today. Institutions have to pay attention to greater diversity in the future than in the past.
- A higher level of skill attainment will be more necessary than ever before. Society in the future will need an even higher level of talent than what we provide today. The level of expectations and the level of competence will be even higher.
- Capabilities for more advanced scientific research will be necessary. Deeper scientific knowledge is essential to better health, to new sources of energy, to more productive technology, and to more assured national defense. Research is still our endless frontier. Productivity will be dependent on high skills but also on new technology through research.
- Capabilities to educate a more active, better-informed, more humanely oriented citizenry will be needed.
- Capabilities to offer greater equality of opportunity and the possibility of a greater equality of earned income will be important.

The Carnegie Council on Policies Studies has made this statement about the comprehensive colleges and universities:

> They are well situated to move now in one and now in another direction as circumstances change. Along with the community colleges, they have demonstrated in the past unusual resiliency in adjusting to new circumstances.[2]

The forward-looking capability of our universities is perhaps our strongest distinguishing feature--our brilliance.

We have other features that make us unusually well suited for future challenges. It has not been until recently that the character of the state universities was recognized as a new and major type of institution in the United States, designed to meet the changing requirements of the nation for increasingly varied and diverse institutions of higher education. Our group of state-supported and controlled public universities joined the other two types of uniquely American institutions of education: the land-grant universities developed in the mid-1800s and the junior and community colleges started around the turn of the century. Only recently has it become clear that our group of comprehensive public state (AASCU) universities represents a third distinguishable type of higher education in America.

Over the years, I have gained a tremendous appreciation for the work that is performed by the normal school/teacher education/technical training/branch campus institutions turned public universities. In our institutions, I have encountered students of superb capacity and ambition, the vast majority of whom work long hours to support themselves throughout their undergraduate and graduate education. These students bring to the campus high hopes, lofty ambitions, and a commitment to serve.

AASCU institutions have, through time, fostered the evolution of a system that places faith in the value of each individual and does not preselect those worthy of continued education. Special efforts have been made to open our doors to those who did not ever dream or aspire to graduate from college--or to the underprepared--or to those formerly excluded. AASCU universities recognize that society benefits when the nation's human resources are fully developed. We have been rewarded time and time again when individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds or those who were underprepared or those who matured later in life became leaders or simply successful participants in our society.

This approach has given us a major edge over other nations that lose the talent of a significant number of their populations by implementing tracking systems or making early decisions about human potential. Ours is a strength in a system in which intelligence is a resource. We are unique, needed, and especially well suited for the future.

In this emerging information society with new needs and challenges evolving constantly, it seems eminently clear that America must have more, not fewer, well-educated individuals. When you note that 63 percent of today's high school graduates enroll in some type of postsecondary work or college and 70 percent of every high school graduating class will eventually attend a postsecondary institution for one or more years, you then realize that we are rapidly moving toward universal mass higher education, at least at the college freshman and sophomore levels.

With our long history of the development of individual potential and our interest in *all* types of students and their development, it seems eminently clear to me that we have a very important central role to play in the year 2010. If we are to remain competitive as world leaders, *all* of our human resources, *all* potential intelligence must be developed. Any lesser effort would ultimately be destructive to our nation's future. Therefore, our type of institutions will be more needed than ever before.

As you can see, no segment of higher education is more needed than our universities, with the charge, mission, and values that we have long held dear.

The Challenge

We have talked about who we are, what we are, and what the future holds for us. What is the challenge?

No segment of higher education faces a greater challenge in *maintaining* and *enhancing* quality and integrity--and at the same time, meeting the educational needs of a wide range of college students or addressing mass education--than AASCU institutions. Our challenge is to address the quality issue in depth in our universities. We are situated in the eye of the storm . . . well designed for future needs but reduced in beauty by clouds about quality.

The challenges are clearly stated in a statement by AASCU's Academic Affairs Resource Center Associates:

> A balance is sought between access for all who can profit from an education and the quality instruction necessary for maximal development of each student; between theory and application in the instructional process, so that teaching, research, and service can all be appropriately emphasized; between liberal education for the student's personal growth and professional education for career preparation; between internal institutional needs and increasing demands of external forces; between regional service on one side and national and international views on the other.

Selective admissions cannot guarantee our quality. We cannot close the door of opportunity for fear of loss of quality. We must chart a course with vision and reality. The challenge lies in how effective we can become in preserving and enhancing *quality* while continuing to reduce the barriers to access. This is not an easy challenge!

The Strategy

How do we address the quality issue at AASCU institutions? Our retention record with high-risk groups, our efforts to personalize the educational process, our teacher training roots in understanding the learning process, our focus on student-faculty interaction, and our

success in raising the aspirations of our students--all are a beginning, but only a beginning. No segment of higher education has a greater challenge in maintaining and enhancing quality than we do.

I recommend four beginning steps:

1. Adopt Alexander Astin's definition of excellence.[3]

2. Use the term *involvement* as the cornerstone of our institutions while we focus on high expectations, humane learning environments, and outcomes rather than on resources, reputation, and input.

3. Assert our leadership as university presidents in the academic areas.

4. Urge AASCU to place the academic affairs area and the quality discussions in the center of its program for the next twenty-five years.

1. Adopt Alexander Astin's definition of excellence.

As the enormously popular discussion of excellence and quality in higher education continues to go on and on, there are few individuals who offer a view of excellence that is compatible with our missions and our value system. The definition of excellence in Alexander Astin's new book, *Achieving Educational Excellence*, is one such definition. Dr. Astin believes that most of the traditional views of excellence are counterproductive to the real purposes of education.

Astin suggests that the traditional views of excellence in higher education--the "reputation and resources" views--are not consistent with the purposes of higher education. If talent development is a principal reason for existence, why not define the excellence of the institution in terms of its *ability to develop the talents of its students and faculty*. You are familiar with Astin's earlier studies, which showed that institutions with highly able students, large libraries, highly paid faculty, and large per-student expenditures do not seem to foster any greater degree of intellectual development than do institutions at the low end of each of those. Even when Bowen looked at much of the literature, he noted that the wide range of variation in the amount of money and resources that institutions have is not associated with any differences in the educational payoff. In other words, just because people believe that an institution is excellent and rank it highly does not necessarily mean that the institution is any more effective in developing talent than a less prestigious institution. Just because an institution has high scores and a great deal of money does not mean it is more effective in developing talent than a less prestigious institution.

According to Astin, both the reputational and resources views failed to meet all three of his evaluation criteria. Neither view is necessarily consistent with the institution's primary purposes--to develop student and faculty talent. Furthermore, adherence to either view offers little possibility of enhancing the overall quality of the higher education system in the United States. Indeed, the resources

conception may paradoxically deplete the total amount of resources available for institutions to invest in their educational programs. Neither the reputation nor the resources view contributes to increasing equal opportunities in higher education.

What are the outcome and content views of excellence? Are these conceptions of excellence consistent with institutional purposes? For example, as mentioned earlier, one is not justified in assuming that any given college outcome, whether it is high retention rates, high earnings after graduation, or whatever, is attributable to the institutional environment. Indeed, studies of Ph.D. productivity show that institutions with high Ph.D. outputs--that is, relatively large proportions of graduates who go on to complete the doctorate--should actually have higher outputs than they do, considering the abilities and interests of the students they admit. In other words, a high and low output cannot itself be any indication of the institution's educational effectiveness.

As for the content approach, there is remarkably little empirical evidence that the liberal arts experience is superior to other types of curricular experiences. Indeed, little research has been done to test this assumption, partly because of the wide variations both in definitions of what constitutes a liberal arts education and the pedagogical techniques used to deliver liberal arts curricula to the students.

Although the outcomes view suffers from some of the same problems as the reputation and resources view, it does offer possibilities for improving the quality of the institution, provided that it is applied with the intention of strengthening the institution's educational and faculty development program. AASCU institutions were one of the first to use such assessments with the APEP projects. The value-added assessment program at Northeast Missouri State University is one such example. Many AASCU institutions have taken the leadership in outcome assessments.

The talent development measure emphasizes the intellectual and personal development of individual students as a fundamental institutional purpose. According to the talent development view, a high-quality institution is one that facilitates maximum growth among its students and faculty and can document that growth through appropriate assessment procedures. Unlike the reputational and resources approaches, the talent development approach to excellence does not limit educational opportunity by identifying only a limited number of colleges and universities as the best. Moreover, under the talent development approach, an educational investment in students at any ability level is justified as long as it pays off in continued intellectual growth and development. The reputational and resources approach, on the other hand, tends to limit the educational opportunities of the less well-prepared students by restricting entry to the best colleges and universities.

2. Use involvement as the cornerstone. Focus on high expectations, establishing a learning environment, and outcomes--NOT on resources, reputation, and input.

According to Astin, involvement appears to be a critical factor in developing students' talents. The most recent NIE report, *Involvement in Learning*, brings together a number of studies verifying that important "involvement" component. Interaction with the faculty, leadership opportunities in campus government, participation in athletics, involvement in honors programs, verbally assertive behavior in the classroom, work-study cooperative education programs, and participation in undergraduate research projects and academic clubs all enhance involvements and the opportunity to receive more from the educational experience.

Many characteristics of the AASCU institutions indicate that they are especially well suited to put "involvement" at the center of the educational enterprise. Most of you are familiar with the NIE report and the ways in which involvement with the faculty and with the institution can be a central value in our institutions.

I have been enormously impressed by the way in which the AASCU universities have been able to generate humane learning environments.

Our goals are directed toward creating humane learning environments focused on the *individual* and working to keep exclusivity and elitism out of our educational process. We approach education without the narrowness of an elitist attitude and its accompanying narrowness of perspective. We place a priority on faculty-student interaction, leadership development, quality, residential life, and the teaching mission. Most of the research has shown that learning in such environments is accelerated and enhanced. The balance lies in insisting on high standards of excellence and creating an atmosphere that encourages change, learning, experimentation, and high performance. The quality of our universities is enhanced by the extent to which we can create these environments.

As AASCU institutions, we must develop research showing that effectiveness of our universities, the very nature of our universities and our basic value, is indeed what enhances the learning process.

When we place the focus on involvement, the human learning environment, high expectations and outcomes, rather than resources, reputation, and input, we create climates that are more conducive to the development of talent.

3. The third solution to addressing the challenge of quality is for presidents to assert our leadership in the academic areas of the university.

As academic leaders, we must adopt Astin's definition of quality and place more emphasis on the environment that we create on our campus.

Clark Kerr says that curriculum reform must begin with the president, and we have much to do. David Riesman and Clark Kerr, in their recent study, found that only 2 percent of the more than 700 college

and university presidents interviewed described themselves as playing a major role in academic affairs. This is an alarming statistic. The president should be the chief academic officer of an institution--not just the chief administrator, recruiter, and fund raiser. As presidents, we are ultimately responsible for the quality of the education the students receive. Placing an emphasis on the president assuming leadership in the academic area and paying particular attention to the quality of the environment is an important step on our campuses. We need to ask the hard questions about curriculum, skill development, rigor, expectations, and so on.

4. Urge AASCU to step forward in the quality debates.

There are many ways for AASCU to address and enhance the quality of our universities. First, I believe that the academic mission statement developed recently by the Academic Affairs Resource Center Associates is a particularly good one. It states to us that we need to put the academic mission of the institution in the center of our purpose as an organization.

Second, I have been urging for quite some time that the Academic Affairs Resource Center be an important area of AASCU. At each of our institutions, we need to strengthen the academic leadership, whether it is at the presidential level, the vice president/provost level, or the deans. Our vice presidents and provosts need each other. They often operate alone without extensive staffs. The myriad issues in the higher education environment necessitates that AASCU take responsibility for assisting to develop academic leadership in our universities. Indeed, AASCU will serve us, as presidents, by helping to strengthen the academic arm of our universities.

Third, as a member of the Task Force on Excellence in Education, I urge all of us to take a more central role in addressing excellence in elementary and secondary education reform and teacher preparation in our states. I urge you to examine your teacher education programs, to insist on high quality in those programs, and to continually be a spokesperson for improvement of excellence in education in your state.

Fourth, I urge the AASCU institutions and us, as presidents, to move to the center of the quality discussion. We have some very important things to say that have been left out of the discussions and studies on excellence. We oftentimes remain silent in our own states and at the national level and allow empty rhetoric to occur that bears no relationship to what is occurring today on our campuses and what the educational needs will be in the future. We should not be intimidated by disagreement in our ranks and lose confidence in what we do.

Fifth, I would like to urge us to take a great deal of pride in our leadership role in developing our type of institution. All of us know that our institutions have been leaders in the pursuit of excellence that is compatible with our mission, values, and our nation's future.

While preserving our open, humane learning environments, our commitment to equal opportunity and access to education, and our com-

mitment to remain responsive to the work force needs of our states--the quality revolution must begin on our campuses, must begin with AASCU, and must begin with us.

The quality issues must be confronted. While setting high expectations for academic performance on our campuses, we will continue to reach out and work closely with the public schools in our state and region as we renew our commitment to the education of teachers. Today's charge will be to remember our gains from partnerships with the world of work and the world of education. We will respond by working closely with all our colleagues in education and in the business world to address these national concerns without losing the important gains we have made in such areas as business, agriculture, technology, nursing.

Our universities are a blend of the world of work, the technically important manpower training responsibilities of a university, and the humanistic values and world of the liberal education. Let us not forget that our universities are precious, stained-glass windows that can withstand and have withstood time--as one of the oldest institutions in our civilization. We can respond to the call for excellence by building on our strengths, using our structures while enhancing the beauty of our image.

I'm proud of what we do in our state universities. In our pursuit of excellence we cannot lose sight of the success that has made a difference in our society and the quality of life for many.

Our stained-glass window--our universities--shine today with diversity, with brilliance, with constancy, with purpose. We look forward to the challenge in the next twenty-five years: enhancing our quality.

Notes

[1] *Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education*, Final Report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).

[2] p. 60.

[3] *Achieving Educational Excellence* (in production).

Distinguished Alumnus Awards

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Award Presentation

John L. Green, Jr.
President
Washburn University of Topeka (KS)

It is an honor and privilege to be here this evening to recognize one of Washburn University's outstanding alumni, someone who has been a strong friend and supporter of his alma mater. I speak of Senator Robert Dole, this year's recipient of the AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Award.

Most of you are probably familiar with the senior senator from Kansas who last year was elected Majority Leader of the United States Senate, that body's highest leadership post. Almost any day of the week you can pick up a newspaper or tune into the evening television news to read or see Bob Dole in action on Capitol Hill--or his equally outstanding wife, Elizabeth Dole, one of President Reagan's Cabinet members.

The senator's roots were firmly established in the wheatfields of Kansas and the battlefields of war. Bob Dole grew up in the small rural community of Russell, Kansas. His father was a grain elevator manager. He attended the University of Kansas and the University of Arizona prior to coming to Washburn, where he earned his A.B. degree and Juris Doctor degree.

But before he came to the Washburn campus, this astute legislator had already earned a reputation for personal courage while fighting for our country on the Italian battlefields during World War II. During that war he was gravely wounded and twice decorated for heroism. What followed were thirty-nine long months of hospital care and recuperation. Needless to say, he has since been a champion of the rights of veterans, the handicapped, and the disadvantaged.

Bob Dole began his illustrious political career while still a student at Washburn. In 1951 he was elected to the Kansas legislature. He later returned home to serve as prosecuting attorney in Russell County. Kansas has benefited from his wisdom and leadership in Congress for the past twenty-five years. After serving four terms in the House, he was elected to the Senate in 1968. In 1980, Bob Dole's fellow Kansans demonstrated their loyalty and support by overwhelmingly reelecting him to the Senate that same year. In fact, he carried every county in Kansas.

Senator Dole has the trust and confidence of his colleagues and constituents, who describe him as fair, pragmatic, and knowledgeable. He is a skillfull and effective leader who knows when to compromise and often relies on just good, plain common sense. For his many accom-

plishments and contributions to our country, he recently received from Washburn University an honorary doctorate of civil law.

I would like to think that not only his conservative Kansas upbringing and military experiences, but also his association with such a fine institution as Washburn University, have contributed in some small way to his success. What I do know for certain is that Bob Dole has not forgotten his alma mater, and his achievements have reflected favorably on Washburn University.

It is with great pride and pleasure that I present to you Senator Bob Dole.

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus

The Honorable Robert Dole
United States Senator, Kansas

Dr. Green, I appreciate very much your generous introduction, and it's certainly a pleasure for me to respond.

I'm honored to receive the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Having gone to the University of Kansas and the Universities of Arizona and Washburn, I think I am somewhat a product of state universities. When I look back on my studies, I see some early stages where I didn't study hard enough, but during my days at the University of Arizona and later at Washburn, I learned that grades are very, very important. So whatever I've been able to achieve reflects in part on my early days at KU, then University of Arizona, and certainly Washburn, where I finished my undergraduate and also received my law degree.

It was at Washburn where I first took an active interest in politics. We had a law librarian there whom I think Dr. Green may know. Beth Bowers convinced a number of us while we were still in law school that we ought to run for the state legislature. We'd never really given the idea much thought and probably hadn't given too much thought about whether we were republicans or democrats, but she encouraged four of us to run. Two of us were elected, and that was sort of my initiation into politics. So my present career traces right back to the Washburn University law librarian.

As it has been for myself, the state university system is an opportunity for hundreds of thousands of young people who cannot always afford private higher education or leave their home state to attend college. As Dr. Green indicated, my parents were hard-working people and did not have the opportunity to attend college. My father was a grain elevator operator, and I've certainly been grateful for my parent's assistance, and it was pretty tough to give us assistance when we were in school and I've certainly been grateful for the kind of education I received from all three universities I attended. Obviously these events all have an impact, though you're never really certain how to measure it. But without a good education there is no doubt in my mind that many, many young people are in a sense left behind, and so I certainly appreciate the great work all of you are doing.

We're sensitive in Congress about education, and I think I can speak in a bipartisan way about the continuing increase in education costs. We believe there is a federal role to play, a very prominent one. We understand that many, many students--again, thousands--would be denied an education were it not for direct assistance from the many, many programs from the federal government, state governments, and private scholarships. So we consider associations such as yours to be the

backbone of the higher education system, and it's certainly a pleasure for all of us in Congress--and I think I again speak for nearly every member of the Senate and nearly every member of the House of Representatives--to congratulate your association for its fine efforts. I am very proud and very honored to receive the Distinguished Alumnus Award.

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus Award Presentation

John E. Worthen
President
Ball State University (IN)

On a television screen a man asks, "Do you know me?"

Yes, Jim Davis, we do know you. You are the one with the infectious smile. It is infectious because the thoughts behind it develop the shenanigans of your cartoon character, Garfield the Cat, bringing crinkly smiles to the faces of readers of nearly 1,800 newspapers around the world twelve different languages. We know you, Jim, because you do not limit Garfield's advertures to newsprint. There is television, for instance, in which "Garfield on the Town" and "Garfield in the Rough" won Emmy awards in 1984 and 1985. There is that television commercial, a first, wherein you and Garfield have dinner together and you wind up paying for it with the famous little green card. And we know you in the literary world because seventeen Garfield books have been named to the *New York Times* bestseller list. More than thirteen million Garfield books have been sold.

For seven years, Jim, you have been drawing Garfield and quartering Odie and John. In those years you have been nominated four times for the Ruben Award, the highest honor in the cartooning profession. And in 1982 you were named as America's best humor strip cartoonist.

We pay tribute to you for paying your dues. After finishing at Ball State in 1967, for nine years you worked over the drawing board as an assistant to T. K. Ryan, the creator of "Tumbleweeds." Your persistence in believing that a cartoon strip about a cat would succeed paid off when the fat, lazy, and cynical Garfield made his debut.

We respect you for the creative entrepreneur that you are. In 1978 Garfield was syndicated by the United Feature syndicate. Today in your Paws Incorporated headquarters near Muncie, Indiana, your Paw staff of twenty-four produces art that leads to the merchandising of more than 5,000 Garfield items marketed by 300 licensees in twenty-six countries aroung the world.

We know you, Jim, for what you have done for your alma mater, Ball State University, and that brings smiles to many faces, particularly to its president. You are far more than a generous benefactor, sharing your financial resources. Last year you and your wife Carolyn headed the university's annual fund drive, working with 900 volunteers to generate more than $2.5 million in contributions to the university.

Carolyn is not only charming and talented, but a full partner in your services to the community and university. And we're proud to number her among our Ball State graduates.

You are never too busy to serve the community and the university. Last summer when the Ball State Jazz Ensemble played in the International Jazz Festival at Montreux, Switzerland, Garfield was there too, decorating the band's music stands. This year, as in years past, Garfield was the poster star for the Delaware County United Way campaign.

It was for such efforts that you were recognized last spring by the Indiana Council for Fund-Raising Executives as the Volunteer of the Year. You hold the Ball State Distinguished Alumnus Award, the highest honor bestowed by the alumni association.

Yes, Jim, we are proud to know you, and we are grateful that you are such an appreciative, sharing, and caring alumnus. At the risk of putting you on the spot, Jim, let me conclude by telling this group why we think you are a model graduate of an AASCU institution. You are imaginative, inquiring, persistent, self-disciplined, an artist who uses his talents to the fullest, a peerless communicator, and a person who continues to learn. These are qualities we hope to develop in all of our students, and they have helped you become an international marketing specialist and enormously successful in your business.

1985 AASCU Distinguished Alumnus

Jim Davis
Cartoonist

I have often said I find humor in everything. On my way to Miami from Hawaii, I was to change planes in Denver. Denver was fogged in. We were forced to land at an Air Force base in Colorado Springs. Since we were on government property, we were not allowed to leave the plane. For the next nine hours I sat there with no water, no food, no phone, and no sense of humor. If you believe in predestination, you may accept the excuse that a supreme being determined I was not to attend the AASCU gathering. In this case, the supreme being was United Airlines.

Even though I was unable to be with you in body, I understand President John Worthen gave a most eloquent speech on my behalf. For that, I think him, and, for the coveted Distinguished Alumnus Award, I thank you.

When I learned I was to receive the award, I was humbled. I had assumed such recognition was reserved for those who have distinguished themselves in more scholarly pursuits, or, at the very least, accomplishments of social or political import.

Al Capp once told me, "It takes two things to become a cartoonist. First, it helps to have been dropped on your head as a small child, and second, you must have no talent, desire, or ability to do anything useful in life." What I'm saying is, I didn't have to have a college degree to do what I do. By honoring me, you have not honored a man for what he has retained in his head . . . but what he has retained in his heart.

I can say without qualification, my college experience at Ball State University laid the foundation for my accomplishments as a cartoonist and businessman. When aspiring cartoonists ask me how to prepare themselves to become syndicated cartoonists, I tell them to go to college and get a good liberal arts education. While art and journalism courses are important, the opportunity to read and assess the world's greatest works of literature is the most important. I tell them, the more they read, the more natural depth their work will have. That advice is usually greeted by blank stares.

While my counsel may not be swelling the ranks of college students, it is, nevertheless, sound. These days many of the romantic notions about the college experience have been replaced by the objective, focused puruit of a specialized degree that will guarantee financial security upon graduation. Many students are so busy preparing for the future they have forgotten to stop and smell the flowers along the way. They don't realize that college experience, in and of itself, is one of the most rewarding and fulfilling experiences in life.

For me, college was a forum for the exchange of ideas. I remember pushing myself, testing myself, and stretching my talents as a humorist. I used to do stand-up comedy routines for my fraternity's parties. As funny as I attempted to be, there was a still funnier guy who lived one house over. I'd steal some of his material, he'd steal some of mine. I finally gave up my quest to be a comedian . . . how was I going to make a living at it if I couldn't even be funnier than David Letterman?

Even though Ball State was a university of nearly 14,000 students when I went there in the '60s, the administration and faculty took a personal interest in each of us. We were encouraged to be responsible, productive adults, but allowed to be the young people we were. While the university officially sanctioned academic achievement as its number one priority, off the record, it was fond of spawning well-rounded individuals. Although there are no definitive college courses on how to become a cartoonist, Ball State gave me all the tools.

All I do is hold a mirror to life and show it back with a humorous twist. More often than not, when you laugh at a comic strip, it isn't necessarily because it is funny, but because you are saying to yourself, "Isn't that true!"

The basic truths in life are much more palatable when embodied in a cartoon character . . . even in the form of a cat like GARFIELD. Basic truths like: "Diet is 'DIE' with a 'T,'" "The first thing you lose on a diet is your sense of humor," "I'm not overweight, I'm undertall," and "Show me a good mouser and I'll show you a cat with bad breath." These sentiments may never end up in *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*, but they have brightened a few reader's days, and have afforded me the opportunity to give something back to my university.

Once again, thank you for your endorsement. My cat and I will do our best to keep you entertained.

Concurrent Session Addresses

The concurrent sessions of the annual meeting provide an opportunity for attendees to grapple with specific issues of particular importance. The panel discussions and informal question and answer formats often adopted at these sessions allow members the opportunity for dialogue. Thus, like general session addresses, they are essential to the success of the annual meeting, and the Association is enormously grateful to session participants for their assistance. Although budgetary constraints precluded our printing the concurrent session addresses in their entirety, the following excerpts of some of the sessions will provide readers with the names of participants and highlights.

Continuity and Change in Undergraduate Education--The AASCU Experience

Participants: President James W. Strobel, Mississippi University for Women (chair); Alexander W. Astin, Professor of Higher Education, University of California, Los Angeles; Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds, California State University; President Thomas A. Bond, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Implementing Technology Innovations: Reflections on Experiences

Participants: Chancellor Martha Kime Piper, University of Houston-Victoria (TX) (chair); President Hoke L. Smith, Towson State University (MD); President Larry J. Blake, Oregon Institute of Technology; Chancellor Philip R. Marshall, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

Smith: Based upon my experience, and that of other micro users, we decided at Towson State on a decentralized office automation plan based on a combination of dedicated word processors and IBM or compatible PCs using a standardized spreadsheet, word processing, and data base. We felt this plan had several advantages. First, we could purchase the equipment incrementaly as funds became available. Second, the user would directly control the machine and its use. Third, the mass storage was infinitely expandable using floppy disks. Fourth, the university equipment could be used by faculty who had their own compatible PCs. We could then support their investment with more expensive printers and other peripherals they might use occasionally. Fifth, there were enough experienced users to provide support to those who were just beginning. Sixth, there was sufficient evidence of the usefulness of the technology in achieving practical purposes within the existing culture. (Of course, people were experimenting with new uses.) Seventh, faculty members who not yet included in the plan were becoming increasingly

knowledgeable about software that would enable them to use the micros for their own purposes.

Because of the slowness of the state to support our equipment acquisition program, we are far from achieving total implementation of our office automation plan. However, the success of the program is perhaps typified by my office. There are now three of us using the computer, and we have to schedule time on the machine. We have another on order. The secretaries who have not yet used the machine are anxious to learn so that they can use it. In short, I feel this has been a successful technology implementation even though it is not yet complete.

Successful implementation of technology is more dependent on software and cultural factors than on the sophistication of the equipment. If I had to do it over, I would spend much more of my time and energy on those aspects.

Blake: Prior to developing the plan for computer implementation, we decided to conduct a full-scale review of the institution's mission and goals. This resulted in the confirmation of OIT's continued mission as a single-purpose polytechnic college emphasizing programs at the leading edge of technological change and emphasizing practical rather than theoretical educational programs.

Based on this decision, and because all of the college's curricular areas required moderate-to-heavy awareness and use of computer technology and because all of its graduates will require substantial knowledge of the use of computers, we determined that our approach to the uses of computers in education would be at the "intensive" level through the implementation of *The Completely Computerized Campus*. The category of "intensive" is from the widely accepted scale of educational computerization of reactive, competitive, intensive, and pioneering.

A white paper, *The Completely Computerized Campus*, was developed as a draft in summer 1983, and shared with the faculty at faculty meetings, senate meetings, department meetings, and special-interest committee meetings, to gain a sense of ownership for the final document by a significant majority of the faculty. This ownership became a reality in early 1984, and the document was finalized as a commitment of the institution for full implementation by fall 1987.

The plan involves the total implementation and coordination of computer resources in instruction, administrative functions, information search and retrieval, and communications. More specifically, it includes the elements of computer-assisted instruction/computer-managed instruction, graphics, CAD/CAM, information search and retrieval, computer literacy, academic management, scheduling/registration, student information, computer/telecomputer conferencing, word processing, electronic mail/files, publications, financial management, directory and management services, electronic bulletin boards, facsimile transmission, two-way digitized video, energy management, security, inven-

tory, auxiliary service management, and all management reporting requirements.

The Design. The proposed distributed system, to be in place by fall 1987, will consist of a main computing system largely used for common data-base storage, program storage, and large number-crunching capacity; a networked intelligent workstation for every faculty member and administrator; a fully computerized library system with on-line search and retrieval capacity; a total campus telecommunications system consisting of a digitized PBX system, a local area network, fiber-optic ties to all buildings and floors, with the capacity of full voice, video, and data communications; and a low-cost, self-purchased portable microcomputer for student use.

Faculty Acceptance. Faculty acceptance of, and enthusiasm for, a substantially increased computerization of instruction, information search and retrieval, and administrative functions, often a serious problem in most institutions of higher learning, does not appear to be the case at Oregon Institute of Technology. Following the introduction of *The Completely Computerized Campus* proposal and the offering of three Computer Awareness seminars in the fall of 1983, a substantial percentage of the faculty requested the offering of a regular introductory course in computer programming for faculty only. This course was offered during winter 1984, and out of 137 teaching faculty, forty-four took the course, approximately forty more could have taught it, and additional courses were requested during subsequent quarters. This has resulted in a near 100-percent computer-literate faculty and a demand for early access to microcomputers. In addition, a majority of the staff of the college have also been involved in literacy workshops and courses.

A Progress Report. At present (September 1985), we are one-third of the way through the plan and are pretty much on target. We started with a Harris 500 mainframe computer and have quadrupled its capacity with the addition of a grant of a Harris 800 computer. We have designed the telecommunications system and are waiting for state approval to submit this system for bids. We have placed a microcomputer in every faculty secretarial office and many other clerical offices on campus. We have placed microcomputers in one-half of the faculty offices (assigned to one-third of the teaching faculty) with access to 100 percent of the faculty. This will be followed by another one-third in spring 1986, and the final one-third in the spring of 1987. We continue to have the main computer terminal and microcomputer lab with sixty-three machines, and have augmented it with open access laboratories in industrial management, engineering technology, and CAD/CAM. We have added to the number of on-line and stand-alone computers in the Academic Support Center and on-line computers in such offices as registrar, admissions, financial aids, housing, college union, development, bookstore, and others. The current hardware inventory is composed of two mainframe computers, two

minicomputers, 125 microcomputers, and ninety-six terminals along with printers, plotters, modems, disc storage, tablets, etc.

Marshall: Based on our experiences in implementing technology at UW-Stevens Point, we can offer the following observations.

1. Any university, such as UW-SP, can replace its current voice communication system and anticipate significant financial savings. For a university confronted with constrained and restrained resources, such a change and gain are beneficial.

2. Any university can implement a voice/data/video backbone in a cost-effective manner. This can be done in a way that provides basic support to the information-processing environment rapidly emerging on every campus. Properly implemented, it will enable faculty and staff members and students to achieve the desired teaching, research, and learning objectives.

3. A fiber-optic transmission system is one of the few realistic and cost-effective systems available to meet fully the demands of the future campus communication technologies. Other systems have severe limitations.

4. Each college and university needs to evaluate its current communication system and its relationship to information-processing technologies. All of us need to take advantage of the emerging and converging technologies.

5. Two cans and a string are not consistent with a university and its information-processing technologies.

AIDS on Campus: Legal and Health Implications

Participants: Richard Keeling, Paul Dee, Thomas Shannon, Executive Director, National School Boards Association

Medical Issues

Keeling: Most people with AIDS have fallen between twenty-five and forty-five years of age, heavily clustered in their thirties. There have been relatively few cases involving people 19-22 years old, and most of us who have traditional students may feel somewhat reassured by that. However, as the total number of cases nationwide rises, the number of AIDS victims of college and university age will probably increase as well. In addition, there are many people who are not traditional students, either by age or whatever, who fall into the AIDS risk category. . . .

A common question I get asked on the phone is, How safe are dormitory rooms? The answer to that, like the answer to most other questions about safety and AIDS, is it depends on what one does there. What one does in the dormitory room is the issue, not the dormitory room itself. AIDS is a disease of behavior. It's a disease that's spread mostly by sexual intercourse and by transmission of blood

products; accordingly, risk of transmission of AIDS can be controlled by behavioral modification. . . .

If universities are going to be effective in educating people about AIDS, they need to be quite graphic in their descriptions of safe and unsafe sexual practices. The most failing programs in AIDS education have been those that talk in abstract terms about exchange of bodily fluids, without using graphic, specific discussion about what those exchanges are. One of the suggestions my task force will make to all universities and their education programs is that they be quite graphic about what it is people should and should not do.

Legal Issues

Dee: The college or university cannot refuse to hire, cannot treat disparately or discharge, any employee who has AIDS or HTLV3-positive tests. Reasonable accommodations of these people as *handicapped* would also be required. Similarly, an education institution receiving federal assistance cannot in its admission or dismissal of students discriminate based on this handicap, if it is defined so, and must make reasonable accommodation of these students while in attendance. At present, "handicapped" is defined in the following way: "A handicapped person means any person who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities" (I guess we all went to law school so we could be employed to figure out the exact meaning of that phrase) "or has a record of such impairment." A definition used by activists states that a handicapped person is a person who is regarded as having such an impairment. Such thinking may well lead to protection of people who have HTLV3-positive tests. . . .

Another issue is employee benefits, particularly in the area of insurance. The premimum cost of insurance, both for health and life, is accelerating rapidly. Insurance carriers are examining the issue of coverage of persons with AIDS and HTLV3-positive tests, and the question, of course, is who should pay. Should insurance companies be permitted to decline coverage for persons with AIDS or HTLV3-positive antibodies as a result of blood or other tests, thereby holding down the costs to the university and others in a plan, leaving the AIDS patient to pay for his or her own costs? Or should insurance companies pass on the cost of coverage, thereby spreading the cost to other insurees--mainly institutions--thereby raising costs? . . .

Another issue is the institutional decision on whether to expose faculty members and students to AIDS patients. If your institution has health care or related programs, this issue will undoubtedly arise. There are treatment questions regarding medical students, dental students, nursing students, physical therapy students, mortician students, and social workers to mention a few.

The first question involves institutional liability for not adequately advising students and faculty of the risks associated with the

treatment they are asked to perform, or for not properly training students in the skills necessary to avoid or minimize exposure.

How do we know transmission occurred in our program? Were the persons previously infected? Should we test persons who are going into this to make a determination on whether they were infected before they went into the program.

Other ancillary questions have arisen in the areas of hands-on treatment, including whether a student or faculty member may be academically or otherwise penalized or disciplined for refusing to treat patients with AIDS. That is, if you send a student into a hospital setting for nurses' training, and the patient to be treated has AIDS, what responsibilities do you have, and may the student refuse to give the treatment? Are you going to force the student to give the treatment?

Recently litigated issues include the question of whether a school system may exclude students with AIDS from full participation in the overall school program? Trial courts are divided on the issue. Most have favored exclusion. However, with the strong new positions taken by the Centers for Disease Control, these decisions may well be overturned. That leads to another question. Would we have exclusion if a case was brought with respect to student housing? Is excluding someone from the classroom a different question from excluding someone from student housing? We don't have the answer because we haven't had the case, but one of you is going to have the privilege of finding out for the rest of us, probably quite soon. Again, in each one of these areas we must apply the balancing test, balancing individual rights--the person with AIDS, the roommate, the parents--with society's rights. . . .

Another issue is the protection of research results. In Florida, the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services recently amended its regulations to require the disclosure of AIDS patients to the department for public health purposes. The problem is that the university has contracted to keep the names of these individuals confidential. Indeed, it has been argued that without confidentiality and the promises maintaining that confidentiality, researchers would be unable to secure research subjects.

Turning to the infirmary setting, what disclosure must a house staff member make to a student seeking treatment or to one who is diagnosed as having AIDS or HTLV3-positive? In Florida we only have to report AIDS positives. In Colorado a recent regulation was passed requiring physicians to report not only people with AIDS but people who have HTLV3-positive tests.

Political Issues

Shannon: In setting institutional policy on AIDS, there is an enormous difference between letting special-interest folk take the

leadership initiative and including them in the process you establish to find acceptable policies and solutions. Only you presidents can take the broad approach to the problem. You have the comprehensive perspective because only you have the global responsibilities. Only you have a duty to society as a whole as well as to all the people involved. This public-policy dimension sets you apart from the special-interest groups with whom you must work. Of course, you are going to have to involve all the interest groups on campus in resolving the problem. But you must set the agenda, or important elements will be sloughed off. . . .

Step One: Identify the people immediately concerned with AIDS and specify their interests: the students both without AIDS and who are healthy and whose health must be protected as well as those students afflicted with or exposed to AIDS; faculty and staff, both healthy and afflicted with AIDS. What are their rights? How can they be balanced?

Step Two: Identify the people tangentially concerned with AIDS--anyone with a particular or general interest in the health of people in the college or university community such as parents, trustees, legislators, the state, county, and city departments of health, the media, and so forth. What are their interests? Identify those interests so that you can work with them and understand the concerns they have and the information and assistance they need from you.

Step Three: Identify the overall public-policy questions that transcend the people immediately and tangentially concerned with AIDS.

Step Four: Set up a process that will involve the people immediately concerned in the exploration of the problem, the identification of the issues, and the drafting of a college or university-wide policy that will even-handedly balance all of the rights and interests.

Step Five: Design an educational program, not just about AIDS itself but also about the policy you are developing or have developed to deal with the practical problems of AIDS. It's important that you not only demystify AIDS as much as possible but at the same time show that you are in clear command of the situation to the extent that anybody can be.

The Public Mission and Private Enterprise: Issues in Revenue Enhancement, Corporate/College Relations and Economic Development

Participants: President Stephen Feldman, Western Connecticut State University (chair); Jana B. Matthews, President, NCHEMS Management Services, Inc.; J. Wade Gilley, Senior Vice President, George Mason University (VA); Ed Cooperman, Executive Vice President, Travel Managment Services, American Express Corporation; Chancellor Robert M. Bersi, University of Nevada System

Minorities and Women in Higher Education: Past Accomplishments and Future Responsibilities

Participants: President Harold Eickhoff, Trenton State College (NJ) (chair); President Miguel A. Nevarez, Pan American University (TX); President James A. Hefner, Jackson State University (MS); President Judith A. Sturnick, University of Maine at Farmington; President Donald Gerth, California State University, Sacramento

Spouses' Program

Spouses' Keynote Session

"President to Spouse--Woman to Women"

Presenter: President Betty Lentz Siegel, Kennesaw College (GA).

Spouses' General Session

"Tax Deductions and Financial Planning for Presidential Families"

Participants: Jo Curris (presiding), University of Northern Iowa, and Myron Lubell (presenter), Florida International University.

Plenary Session

Report of the Chairman

Aubrey K. Lucas
President
University of Southern Mississippi

My AASCU colleagues, I'm pleased to report that in my judgment this association has through this past year continued to be vigorous, responsive, and relevant--not *because* of the chair's leadership but *in spite of* it and because there is a twenty-five year progressive momentum in this wonderful organization that helps keep it moving as it ought.

The one complaint I hear about AASCU is really a testimony to strength. Some complain that our annual meetings are so filled with scheduled sessions that there's little time for much-needed relaxation, which indicates that the program planners use every minute to provide a wide range of opportunities to discuss the multitude of topics that emerge in this richly diverse association. Our crowded agenda is a sign that we don't duck the issues. We face them and attempt to resolve them. The fact that we feel guilty when we absent ourselves from these sessions is an indication of our commitment as individuals to this organization and to our positions as presidents of important institutions.

May I mention quickly several of the strengths of AASCU as I see them.

As a member of the board of directors and as chair of the association it has been my pleasure to become acquainted with a large cross-section of our membership. AASCU has an immensely impressive group of presidents in its ranks. The abilities of these presidents stacks up very favorably with those in any other group of colleges and universities. I make this statement after having observed presidents and chancellors in my associations in ACE, NCAA, College Football Association, Metro Conference, Southern Regional Education Board, and other such groups. The willingness of these AASCU presidents to use their talents in this organization is truly one of its great strengths. If you can find more effective or dedicated staff than ours, I want to meet them. In a survey of college and university presidents, Allan Ostar was named among the top five individuals in this country who have great impact and influence on public higher education. When the public and private sectors were considered, he was among the top ten. I know of no more effective chief executive officer anywhere than Allan; his coworkers are top notch; I have yet to hear a complaint about our AASCU staff. On the other hand compliments are very frequently expressed, although time will not permit my naming each one of them.

AASCU uses its resources well, as our treasurer will tell you. We work hard to keep our financial house in good order; our income is

handled wisely, even frugally. We don't waste money in AASCU, we're not overstaffed, and our staff would assure you that they're not overpaid.

On several occasions I have commented about our open system for choosing our board and officers in this association. We will not want to take that for granted. Such a system ensures that AASCU will have within itself the capacity to correct its errors and to ensure its relevance. Our rotation system for board and committee service is certainly another strength. As much as some of us enjoy membership on the board and on key committees, we must understand and insist that rotation be observed.

There are suggestions that we review the purposes and the usefulness of some of our committees. This we ought to do, but let us not forget that the committee system is our primary means of getting all member presidents involved in the important issues of this association. We need a committee system, but we may not need some of our present committees. Our committees are generally effective when there are at least three elements present--first, a chair who moves the committee to action; second, staff support to keep our busy chairs reminded of their responsibilities and to assist them with committee work; third, a clearly demonstrated need for the existence of a particular committee. In my opinion, our committees are indeed a strength of the association.

One of the most exciting developments in AASCU during the past year and one that holds unbelievable potential is the development of our AASCU Foundation. The foundation grew out of our Committee on Revenue Enhancement. Because of Allan Watson's hard work, we now have in place several opportunities not only to bring in additional revenue to AASCU, but also to help our member institutions secure goods and services at reduced rates. We must find a way for every one of our institutions to know about these opportunities. Are you aware that soon you will be able to offer to your faculty, staff, students, and alumni MasterCards and Visa cards at a 15-percent discount. Your institution will get five dollars for each card issued as well as five dollars for each card renewed. The AASCU Foundation will receive 1 percent of the total dollars charged to those particular cards. We can already make available to you American Express Travel Cards to those designated by you at a charge of five dollars per card. This five dollars is later returned to your foundation as a gift. Further, American Express has reached an agreement for travel services with AASCU institutions whereby it pays to the AASCU Foundation 2-1/2 percent of all travel business done through them by AASCU institutions participating in that agreement. We're looking at other proposals that will be mentioned later in the meeting; however, we need your help when we send questionnaires to determine your needs and your interests. Please see that they are completed and returned as promptly as possible. I know you understand that if we can increase our income through the foundation, we can decrease our reliance on dues income.

It has been a pleasure to serve as your chair, and I deeply appreciate the friendship and the support you have extended to me over the year. It is now my pleasure to present our president, whose youthfulness in countenance and spirit for the past twenty years is certainly matched by his energy and vision--Allan Ostar.

Report of the President

Allan W. Ostar

I want to make some observations and comments based on what we have been doing this past year. Today's educational climate dictates that AASCU address the "prospect" half of our annual meeting under "Retrospect and Prospect," and yet for perspective I'd like first to speak briefly about AASCU and retrospect. Historically, I believe our association's ability to deal successfully with a wide range of issues, projects, and programs in higher education is attributable primarily to the fact that ours is a membership-driven organization. AASCU's charter members knew almost intuitively that an association of institutions would be nationally viable only if governed from the bottom up and not from the top down, that it would be capable of continuous self renewal only if its members were involved across the board in its professional endeavors. Our founders wanted the chief executive officers of AASCU's member institutions to call the shots on association policies and activities.

That's the way AASCU began back in February 1961, and it continues today as we begin the celebration of our silver jubilee year. Our annual report for 1985 has been distributed. We won't take time now to review that. I hope you can find time to look at it with some care and then perhaps circulate it among your colleagues back home so that they might capture a sense of the scope and diversity of the association's activities. Three hundred and sixty-eight institutions now form AASCU, and, from both a financial and programmatic standpoint, we are in a strong position. Our steady growth combined with the resilience AASCU has shown time and time again over the past quarter century demonstrate that. We have learned, I believe, how to fulfill at least three functions essential to organizational success:

First, the *partnership function* of working cooperatively and constructively with other organizations and other agencies to achieve shared policy objectives; second, the *stewardship function* of serving as guardian to the programs and ideas essential to the goals of public higher education; and third, the *leadership function* of breaking new ground in public policy formalation, pioneering and program innovation, and serving as an advanced guard for identifying and resolving issues of national and state concern.

All three of these functions are obviously interdependent and interrelated, and given the complexities of organizational management no single function can be completely separated from the other two. But today as we look back on AASCU's history, I feel confident that critics will judge that we have succeeded as partner, as steward, and as leader in many ways that have advanced the mission of public higher education. I am not here to suggest that we rest on our laurels or that we revel

in the excellent state of our association's health. We aren't about to go under tomorrow or the day after, and we will continue to face squarely the major contemporary issues in higher education inspired by the challenges our founders confronted, knowing how difficult those beginnings were. Yet, renewed in faith and vigor by their successes, we will need that vision and renewal to consolidate our energies for several tests of our partnership, our stewardship, and our leadership capabilities in the months and years to come.

First of all, I am concerned about the relationship between AASCU members and other postsecondary institutions in the public sector. While the organizational relationship and partnership between AASCU, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) continues to function effectively at the national public policy level, I fear that the institutional partnership among our respective members at the state level is endangered. At least in several regions of the country, our AASCU, AACJC and NASULGC members increasingly find themselves competing students, for state appropriations, for turf rights, and for educational prestige. Many factors contribute to this saddening turn of affairs--demographic, economic, bureaucratic, and political. You know them better than I, and they vary from state to state and region to region. There was a time when public policy issues such as tuition levels, faculty salary scales, institutional autonomy, program development, governance, equity, and academic standards served to unite the public sector institutions, but today in some states the time-tested public sector coalition would seem to be slowly coming apart at the seams to the satisfaction, I'm forced to say regretfully, of a few leaders of state higher education regulatory or coordinating agencies. We have forgotten the old adage, apparently, that a rising tide lifts all boats. The states need to be sold on the importance of all sectors of public higher education, and the regulatory or coordinating boards should be our colleagues in this endeavor.

But how has their role in governance evolved? We recently sent to you a reissued *Efficiency of Freedom* report from the Committee for Government and Higher Education, first published in 1959, two years before AASCU was founded. In the report, the committee cautions against permitting state intrusions on the autonomy of public postsecondary institutions. It also cautions against the growth of bureaucracies at the state level that deal with public colleges and universities lest they become large, impersonal regulatory machines like the Department of Motor Vehicles or the Bureau of Public Works: If that committee were to view the educational landscape today, it would see that some of its worst fears have come true--layer after layer of unelected state bureaucrats passing judgment on institutional plans, systemwide budgets, and academic programs, joined now by elected officials who overnight have somehow become experts on admissions policies, academic

standards, entrance requirements, and performance examinations--issues traditionally within the purview of the faculties, college administrators, and institutional governing boards.

Just as our public sector partnership threatens in some states to unravel, so too has our stewardship of concepts and policies essential to the integrity of the academic enterprise and threatened in many regions by the intrusions I've mentioned from outside the academic community--whether from idealogical organizations, such as Accuracy in Academia, or from state legislators drafting laws which will, in effect, deny access to public higher education to millions of disadvantaged Americans in the name of quality and excellence or from industries touting universities as the "be all" and "end all" of economic development. These intrusions--some from those who wish us well, others from those who do not--are symptoms of the fact that our stewardship is indeed threatened.

If you add potential ruptures in the public-sector partnership to apparent vulnerabilities in our stewardship, it means we stand in real danger of permitting public higher education to become stratified. We must never forget that our public colleges and universities are the mainstream of higher education. If we don't speak up for granting minorities greater access to educational opportunities, who will? If we don't resist the encroachments of public officials, elected and nonelected alike, who will? If we don't champion academic freedom on our campuses, who will? If we don't caution industries and corporations not to raise public expectations about the miracles they claim colleges can perform in the cause of economic development, who will? If we can't persuade legislators and governors that tuition at public colleges must not be allowed to soar, who can? If we can't persuasively and accurately define the tenets of public higher education for a populace yearning for an expansion of postsecondary opportunities, who can? If an association whose member institutions produce more than half of the teachers certified annually in America can't pioneer in promoting reforms designed to improve teacher preparation and teacher performance, what association can?

That brings us to the leadership function in the prospect for AASCU's future. Our leadership in the public policy arena will face severe tests over the next half decade in the states and in Washington. I have already referred to some of the tensions developing within the public sector of higher education resulting from the growing competition for scare resources. Realistically we know that competition is going to increase, not decrease, in the years ahead with respect to the federal government. Clark Kerr recently said that he foresees no new funds or initiatives for higher education for the balance of the decade. With requests from postsecondary institutions for increased state appropriations will come state governmental pressures to raise tuition. Many of you are already coping with such pressures and realize how divisive they can be both on campus and between institutions and

systems. To know the tensions induced by limited resources at the federal level, you need only to read your own newspaper or watch the nightly network news. To make prospects even worse, when tuitions begin spiraling upward postsecondary opportunities for disadvantaged youths will decline. When that happens, and as studies by AASCU have shown in many parts of the country the tradegy is already underway, when access to educational opportunities narrow, our state colleges and universities cease to fulfill their mission and the nation suffers irreparable damage. In every state, from the governors and state legislators on down, public higher education needs more advocates. AASCU members need to get this message across. The states are to education what the federal government is to national defense. That's the AASCU equation, and it's our task to drive it home at every opportunity.

Two outcomes of this annual meeting will help us lead the way. The first is the three-year public information program recommended by our Committee on External Relations and considered by the membership this afternoon. That program will concentrate on sharpening the identity of AASCU institutions in the public's mind and thus strengthen support for our state colleges and universities among the wide range of constituencies. The second is the newly organized National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities, under the chairmanship of Ted Bell, that will help AASCU institutions chart their course for the years immediately ahead. The commission's report, to be issued in conjunction with next year's annual meeting, will be a major step in developing public understanding of the AASCU equation and enhancing our founders' vision that state colleges and universities represent mainstream America at its best. But in the last analysis, the success of the association's public information program and the effectiveness of the commission's report will depend on your presidential leadership. As public leaders you will need to speak out not in self-service but to bring home to your constituencies the real issues behind federal deficit reduction efforts, such as the Gramm-Rudman amendment now before Congress. With this amendment, Congress is playing chicken with the health, safety, and education of future generations. In any deficit reduction initiative, what is needed is a truly balanced approach, one that will take into consideration the need for additional revenues as well as entitlement and expenditure reductions. Only by such carefully thoughtout approaches to the budget can we ensure that future generations will receive an education of high quality, that basic research in science and medicine will be maintained, and that the nation will meet its defense needs. Leadership is needed also to improve teacher preparation, and AASCU institutions in my opinion, have no greater responsibility than educating those who will teach future generations of Americans. Presidential leadership is essential (1) to keep open the door to educational opportunity for all who can profit from going to college; (2) to continue to emphasize quality in undergraduate education; (3) to stimulate faculty members to grow

professionally so that they can contribute their talents for the benefit of the citizens who support them; (4) to extend a chance to go to college to adults of all ages by making continuing education an integral part of the institutional mission and not just a side show to men and women in the armed services and to other adults beginning postsecondary work in community colleges or trade and technical schools.

Twenty years ago this month the Higher Education Act of 1965 was signed. AASCU was involved in shaping that legislation every step of the way. We were still a fledgling organization, but both the White House and the Congress knew that they could count on AASCU presidents for leadership and support in every corner of the land. Today, the American people must know that they can count on the presidents of our state colleges and universities for responsible public leadership in the years ahead.

Report of the Treasurer

Myron L. Coulter
Chancellor
Western Carolina University (NC)

I would like to make this presentation in two parts--first, the report of how AASCU ended fiscal 1985 and then, the Board of Directors' proposals for fiscal years 1987-89.

AASCU has received its 1985 audit report from Alexander Grant and Company, our certified public accountants. The report indicates that our procedures were in order and that we ended the fiscal year with $44,531.00 excess of revenues over expenses in our general fund. When this amount was added to our opening fund balance it permitted the association to enter fiscal 1986 with an operating reserve of $730,141.00 less commitments. In addition, funds in the amount of $66,914.00 were transfered to the permanent reserve fund in compliance with the Board policy that it should contain 50 percent of the association's operating budget. Quite clearly, our member support coupled with sound fiscal management has allowed AASCU to enter a new year in a healthy financial condition.

The three-year budget proposal you must vote on today covers fiscal years 1987-89. The process for the budget development involves the membership, the Board, and the AASCU staff. You will recall that a survey was conducted of the membership to determine its program priorities. The results of that survey were analyzed by the staff, and a series of budget recommendations was made to the Board of Directors by the staff based on the responses in the survey. The Board considered all of these proposals, reduced or eliminated some to keep costs down, and developed a budget for your consideration today that recommends a dues increase of 7 percent per year for each of the three coming fiscal years. I might add also that this option was selected from among five options ranging from 5 percent, which was essentially a no-growth budget in any respect other than to meet some inflationary cost, to 16 percent which would accommodate all of the requests for additional services by members. The Board elected the 7-percent proposal; 7 percent in each of the three years. This increase will fund those activities judged most essential to the membership; it will allow for coverage of anticipated inflationary costs; and it will provide for some reasonable increases in programs and services for you. It will also cover some known increases in fixed costs such as rent, insurance, printing, telephone, and postage. Although there is a modest deficit projected for each of the three years, the Board feels confident that, based on the association's past history and our fiscal performance, the proposal is a responsible one. On behalf of the Board I recommend your approval of our three-year budget and the accompanying dues increase and, Mr. Chairman, I move approval of the three-year budget as proposed.

Alexander Grant
& Company
Certified Public Accountants

Member Firm
Grant Thornton International

Board of Directors
American Association of State
Colleges and Universities

We have examined the balance sheet of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities as of June 30, 1985, and the related statements of revenue, expenses and changes in fund balances and changes in financial position for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly the financial position of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities at June 30, 1985, and the results of its operations and changes in its financial position for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Washington, D.C.
September 17, 1985

2000 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 296-7800

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Balance Sheet/June 30, 1986

Assets

	Unrestricted					
	General fund	Revolving fund	Permanent reserve fund	Total	Restricted funds	Total
CURRENT ASSETS						
Cash	$ 3,950	$ -	$ -	$ 3,950	$ -	$ 3,950
Investments (note B)	860,579	80,135	689,440	1,630,154	-	1,630,154
Contract and grant receivables (note A3)						
Billed	-	-	-	-	276,611	276,611
Unbilled	-	-	-	-	11,384	11,384
Other receivables (note A3)	20,362	-	-	20,362	-	20,362
Prepaid expenses	56,538	-	-	56,538	-	56,538
Total current assets	941,430	80,135	689,440	1,711,005	305,995	2,017,000
LONG-TERM INVESTMENTS (note B)	50,000	-	-	50,000	-	50,000
PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT, at cost, less accumulated depreciation and amortization of $101,500 (note A4)	109,031	-	-	109,031	-	109,031
	$1,100,461	$80,135	$689,440	$1,870,036	$305,995	$2,176,031
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES						
CURRENT LIABILITIES						
Bank overdraft	$ 11,598	$ -	$ -	$ 11,598	$ -	$ 11,598
Accounts payable	64,615	2,647	-	67,262	-	67,262
Deferred membership dues and fees (note A5)	463,800	-	-	463,800	-	463,800
Deferred contract and grant revenues (note A5)	-	-	-	-	30,339	30,339
Accrued salaries and payroll taxes	22,539	-	-	22,539	2,960	25,499
Accrued annual leave	44,155	-	-	44,155	13,662	57,817
Interfund balances (note A2)	(256,367)	12,467)	-	(259,034)	259,034	-
Total current liabilities	370,320	-	-	370,320	305,995	676,315
COMMITMENT (note F)	-	-	-	-	-	-
FUND BALANCES (notes A2 and C)						
Operating reserve	173,770	-	-	173,770	-	173,770
Designated by the Board of Directors	556,371	80,135	689,440	1,325,946	-	1,325,946
Total fund balances	730,141	80,135	689,440	1,499,716	-	1,499,716
	$1,100,461	$80,135	$689,440	$1,870,036	$305,995	$2,176,031

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this statement.

87 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Statement of Revenue, Expenses and Changes in Fund Balances

Year ended June 30, 1965

	Unrestricted					
	General fund	Revolving fund	Permanent reserve fund	Total	Restricted funds	Total
Revenue (note A5)						
Membership dues	$1,170,451	$ -	$ -	$1,170,451	$ -	$1,170,451
OFP participation fees	361,154	-	-	361,154	-	361,154
Contracts and grants	-	-	-	-	1,141,706	1,141,706
Interest	155,339	-	-	155,339	-	155,339
Annual meeting	-	47,816	-	47,816	-	47,816
Publications	13,559	59,330	-	72,889	-	72,889
OIP Project Development	-	24,300	-	24,300	-	24,300
Gain on sale of investments (note B)	41,730	-	-	41,730	-	41,730
Other	17,196	-	-	17,196	-	17,196
	1,759,429	131,448	-	1,849,147	1,141,706	2,990,853
Expenses						
Salaries, wages, payroll taxes and employee benefits	1,186,540	4,805	-	1,191,345	213,767	1,405,112
Travel	49,120	11,157	-	60,277	45,489	105,766
Publications	40,251	3,981	-	44,232	-	44,232
Office rent (note F)	167,312	686	-	167,998	29,069	197,067
Equipment rent	6,947	997	-	7,944	599	8,543
Telephone and telegraph	55,216	736	-	55,952	7,297	63,249
Printing and duplicating	60,667	14,915		75,602	100,276	175,878
Office supplies and expense	20,199	74	-	20,273	2,855	23,128
Depreciation (note A4)	22,180	-	-	22,180	-	22,180
Postage	30,721	1,682	-	32,403	10,898	43,301
Consultants	26,265	5,300	-	31,565	72,175	103,740
Committee and board of directors' meetings	10,631	-	-	10,631	-	10,631
Stipends	1,500	-	-	1,500	158,969	160,469
Insurance	26,422	-	-	26,422	-	26,422
Legal and audit	37,543	-	-	37,543	-	37,543
Conferences and meetings	436	29,350	-	29,786	126	29,912
Services	151,882	15,196	-	166,998	73,321	240,319
Subcontract costs	-	-	-	-	99,554	99,554
Bad debt expense	5,965	-	-	5,965	-	5,965
Other	97,390	11,329	-	108,719	45,144	153,863
Indirect cost recovery (note A6)	(282,229)	-	-	(282,229)	282,229	-
	1,716,898	100,208	-	1,817,106	1,141,768	2,958,874
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES	44,531	31,240	-	75,771	-	75,771
Fund balances, beginning of year	690,860	48,895	684,170	1,423,945	-	1,423,945
Transfer from general fund to permanent reserve (note B)	(5,270)	-	5,270	-	-	-
Fund balances, end of year	$ 730,161	$ 80,135	$689,440	$1,499,716	$ -	$1,499,716

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes to Financial Statements

Note A - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

1. *Basis of Presentation.* The financial statements of the Association have been prepared on the accrual basis. A summary of the significant accounting policies consistently applied in the preparation of the accompanying financial statements follows.

2. *Fund Accounting.* To ensure observance of limitations and restrictions placed on the use of resources available to the Association, the accounts of the Association are maintained in accordance with the principles of fund accounting. This is the procedure by which resources for various purposes are classified for accounting and reporting purposes into funds established according to their nature and purposes. Separate accounts are maintained for each fund; however, in the accompanying financial statements, funds that have similar characteristics have been combined into fund groups. Accordingly, all financial transactions have been recorded and reported by fund group.

The assets, liabilities, and fund balances of the Association are reported in four self-balancing fund groups as follows:

- The general fund represents the portion of expendable funds that are available for support of Association operations.
- The revolving fund represents funds for self-funding activities, including annual meeting, certain marketable publications, certain computer projects and reciprocity costs of overseas missions.
- The permanent reserve fund represents funds for any potential contingencies which could arise. Income earned on investments in the fund is recognized as income of the general fund.
- Restricted funds represent funds which are subject to restrictions of contracts and grants with various organizations to perform studies and research related to state colleges and universities. The funds received are for specific purposes, and when funds remain at the termination of a project the balance is returned to the funding organization or transferred to current projects, if authorized by the funding organization.

3. *Accounts Receivable.* The Association considers accounts receivable at June 30, 1985 to be fully collectible; accordingly, no allowance for doubtful accounts is required. If amounts become uncollectible, they will be charged to operations when that determination is made.

4. *Property and Equipment.* Depreciation and amortization are provided for in amounts sufficient to relate the cost of depreciable assets to operations over their estimated service lives, principally on a straight-line basis. Leasehold improvements are amortized over the life of the respective lease or service life of the improvements, whichever is shorter.

5. *Revenue.* Membership dues and participation fees are recognized as revenue over the period of membership, which is on a fiscal-year basis. Revenue and expenses associated with workshops and meetings are recorded in the period in which the workshops are held. Restricted revenue is recognized to the extent of expenses incurred.

6. *Indirect Cost Recovery.* Administrative expenses are allocated from the general fund to the restricted fund in accordance with the provisions of the applicable contracts and grants.

7. *Income Taxes.* Under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and the applicable income tax regulations of the District of Columbia, the Association is exempt from taxes on income other than unrelated business income. No provision for income taxes is required as of June 30, 1985 since the Association had no income from unrelated business activities.

Note B - Investments

Investments are presented in the financial statements in the aggregate at the lower of cost or fair market value.

	Cost	Market
Unrestricted funds	$1,680,154	$1,729,720

Investments are composed of the following:

	Cost	Market
Certificates of deposit	$ 400,000	$ 400,000
Money market funds	739,894	739,894
Corporate stocks and bonds	490,260	539,826
Debt securities	50,000	50,000
	$1,680,154	$1,729,720

Net realized gain on sale of corproate stocks and bonds totaled $41,730. Total interest earned on investments totaled $155,339.

Note C - Designations by the Board of Directors

The Board of Directors has approved the fiscal eyar 1986 budget which includes the following additional designations of the general fund balance:

Depreciation of furniture and fixtures	$109,032
Furniture and computer equipment	220,000
AASCU Foundation	95,000
Transfer to Permanent Reserve Fund	66,914
Task force on excellence	5,995
Contingencies	35,000
Publications and awards	11,000
Key-person insurance	13,430
	$556,371

Note D - Interfund Transfers

During the year ended June 30, 1985 the Board of Directors authorized a transfer from the general fund to the Permanent Reserve fund in the amount of $5,270 representing investments purchased with resources of the general fund.

Note E - Government Contracts

The Association has entered into cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts with the U.S. Government and its agencies. Revenues are recognized based upon the amount of costs incurred. In 1985, approximately 26 percent of revenue resulted from contracts with U.S. Government agencies.

Certain contract costs billed to the U.s. Government are subject to audit by the Defense Contract Audit Agency. The agency has audited costs billed through June 30, 1983. the periods ended June 30, 1985 and June 30, 1984 are subject to future examination. In management's opinion, any future unallowable costs have been adequately provided for.

Note F - Commitment

The Association currently leases office space from the American Council on Education, under a lease agreement which expires in 1988. The agreement provides for rental payments equal to a fixed minimum guaranteed annual base rent (base rent) adjusted annually to reflect any increases in the consumer price index. The minimum rental commitment (base rent) is $146,544 per annum through December 1988. Rental expense for the year ended June 30, 1985 was $197,007.

Note G - Retirement Plan

The Association has a contributory, defined-contribution retirement plan. All full-time employees who have completed one year of service

and attained age 25 or who have completed three years of service regardless of age are eligible. The contributions are used to purchase individual annuities, the rights to which are immediately vested with the employees. The cost of the plan for the year ended June 30, 1985 was $67,983.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Summary of Restricted Funds Transactions
Year ended June 30, 1985

Funding source	Deferred revenue, June 30, 1984	Receipts, transfers and accruals	Resources available or obligated	Expenses incurred	Deferred revenue, June 30, 1985
Department of Defense					
Servicemembers' Opportunity College - 1984	$16,574	$ 270,613	$ 287,187	$ 287,187	$ -
Servicemembers' Opportunity College - 1985	-	495,958	495,958	495,958	-
Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities	288	-	288	-	288
Various corporations					
Buenos Aires Cooperation Program	1,613	-	1,613	-	1,613
Council on College/Corporate Relations	1,398	-	3,398	3,398	-
IBM World Trade Americas/Far East Corporation - Malaysian Exchange Program	2,000	-	2,000	-	2,000
Funding for Agriculture and Renewable Resources	6,896	-	6,896	1,936	4,960
National Endowment for the Humanities - Islam - 1984	-	83,551	83,551	82,203	1,348
University of Liberia - Students Fund	10,825	174,009	184,834	165,810	19,024
Exxon Foundation - Academic Year in New York City	-	38,000	38,000	38,000	-
American Council on Education/Ford - Public Higher Education Student Aid Study	-	62,054	62,054	62,054	-
American Association of State Colleges of Agriculture and Renewable Resources					
Special Projects - 1984	2,842	426	3,268	3,268	-
Special Projects - 1985	-	3,000	3,000	1,894	1,106
	$44,436	$1,127,611	$1,172,047	$1,141,708	$30,339

Report on AASCU Foundation

Joseph A. Caputo
President
Millersville University of Pennsylvania

Positioned as I am on the agenda, I'm reminded of the story of Moses, who, in descending from the Mount to report to the chosen people, indicated that he negotiated The Commandments down to ten, as the good news; the bad news was that adultery was still in! You will have to discern the good news and the bad news for yourself in my report.

Resolved, that the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) hereby ratify and approve the resolution adopted by the AASCU's Board of Directors authorizing the formation of a new nonprofit corporation to be organized under the laws of the District of Columbia for the purpose of assisting, promoting, supporting and benefiting AASCU--in particular, by managing, on behalf of AASCU, assets including royalty rights for the use of AASCU's name and logo; and be it further resolved, that the AASCU Board of Directors are hereby authorized and directed to take those steps deemed necessary for the formation and implementation of the AASCU Foundation. On November 19, 1984, at last year's annual meeting, I had the privilege of placing this resolution before you on behalf of the Committee on Special Projects and the board. The motion, you may recall, was adopted unanimously, thereby prompting a series of subsequent events. The AASCU Foundation was chartered in the District of Columbia on December 19, 1984; held its organizational meeting at Point Clear, Alabama, on January 21, 1985; and was granted 501(C)3 tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service on April 1, 1985. The AASCU Foundation Board of Directors meeting at Point Clear, Alabama, adopted six long-term objectives. The objective identified as the most urgent was the initiation of a product endorsement program that would involve the licensure of AASCU's name and logo.

Today I can report that the foundation has completed negotiations leading to its endorsement of eight firms. In each case an important service or product will be made available to AASCU member institutions at a highly competitive price. In some cases services or savings not normally available to individuals or member institutions will be provided. In virtually every case, the participating institution will receive some direct financial return in the form of discretionary income and AASCU will receive a small royalty.

The eight firms currently endorsed by AASCU include: American Express, for its business travel and corporate card services (indeed, over 100 AASCU institutions have asked for additional information in the early stages of this program, and approximately fifty have already signed agreements to participate in the corporate card program);

Johnson and Higgins, for its insurance brokerage services (Johnson and Higgins, one of the world's largest insurance brokers, will design, develop, and market a pooled risk insurance program to potential insurance underwriters); the John O. Todd Organization, acting with Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, for a unique supplemental compensation program designed specifically for AASCU's presidents and chancellors; Sear's Business Centers, for personal computers at significant savings for faculty and staff members and alumni (brand names such as IBM, Apple, AT&T, and Compac, including software and maintenance contracts, are covered in this endorsement); MBank USA for Visa and MasterCard personal cards, as opposed to the American Express corporate card, for nonbusiness use, for faculty and staff members, alumni, and students; the Kinsman Group, for establishment of an AASCU cultural affairs network (cultural events from participating institutions will be videotaped and marketed to cable TV networks; this program should provide an excellent opportunity to showcase exemplary cultural arts productions, outstanding faculty members, talented students, special facilities and even entire institutions); Homequity, for various forms of relocation assistance for both faculty and staff members (from Homequity, home sales assistance, marketing, management of rental property, home finding assistance, and movement of household goods are all services that will be made available); Wood and Company, for technology park consulting and development services (through Wood and Company selected AASCU member institutions can access the expertise required to move a technology park from concept into being).

A second high-priority concern was the need to provide reliable professional assistance on patents and their subsequent licensure to AASCU member institutions. I'm again pleased to report that AASCU has just concluded negotiations with Research Corporation of Tucson, Arizona, to provide the support needed by AASCU-member institutions to facilitate the technology transfer process from the laboratory to the public sector. The services available through Research Corporation include evaluation of invention disclosures, patenting, licensing to industry, and maintenance of the resulting agreements.

Finally, a prospectus for the establishment of the AASCU Foundation Capital Fund has been submitted to the board for its review. Approval would result in the establishment of a pooled investment fund for all interested member institutions. The goal would be long-term capital growth by investment in listed securities. One of the most important characterictics distinguishing the AASCU fund from others is that although AASCU will serve as the sponsor, the depositors will be the member owners. The members owners, i.e., participating AASCU member institutions, will select the trustees, and only they can adjust the structure of the fund. In our recent meeting, a few days ago, we considered this initiative potentially of such import to our member institutions that we're going to correspond with you about this again individually. We hope that you will give it your personal attention. We

will also make special materials available that would be more suitable for the fiscal vice president of your institution, to give you some additional support on campus.

In closing I would like to quote from the report that Allan Watson, executive vice president of the AASCU Foundation, delivered to the foundation board this past Friday afternoon: "Much has been accomplished since last November, but even greater strides should be possible in the coming year. The foundation groundwork has been laid. It is ready to be built upon, and AASCU should realize the first harvest from its labors in the form of royalty income. What has been accomplished to date represents the beginning of a new and exciting direction in which the foundation must continue to move. With resolute commitment to the advancement of higher education, and with the dedicated and innovative leadership that characterizess those who lead the AASCU member institutions, a rewarding and exciting future lays ahead. There is much more specific information provided to you in a written report, and there will be, as I mentioned, direct individual correspondence with you. Those of us close to the development of the foundation believe that this is an exciting and historic initiative on the part of AASCU.

Report of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

Ellis E. McCune
President
California State University, Hayward

AASCU continues to be well represented in the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). Charles Austin is AASCU's designee to serve on the Assembly of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations, and E. K. Fretwell is a member of the board of COPA. I have the pleasure of serving as COPA chairman this year and next year, so we do have a voice in COPA circles.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the things COPA has done in the last year. Most important, perhaps, is COPA's completion of its first five years under the new organizational plan adopted in 1980 and then in accordance with the action of the COPA board. In adopting that plan, it is presently undertaking a comprehensive self-study of the organization. A self-study advisory group then will be appointed by the executive committee to conduct the study between April and October of next year. COPA is presently soliciting suggestions for persons of distinction to serve on that advisory group and also for items that ought to be included in the self-study. If you have such suggestions I encourage you to send them to one of the three of us who represent AASCU or to Richard Millard, president of COPA.

During the past year COPA has continued to deal with a number of agencies seeking recognition. The Committee on Accreditation met yesterday with representatives of two such accrediting agencies--the American Physical Therapy Association and the Computer Science Accreditation Board--to talk with them about their plans for changes or for seeking accreditation.

Another organization in which many of you are involved, the National Association for Public Administration Accreditation, is in the final stages of seeking COPA recognition for its accrediting activities. You are always encouraged to forward any comments you may have about organizations up for review by COPA or organizations seeking recognition by COPA. These comments will be given consideration by the Recognition Committee.

The board of COPA at its last meeting accepted the report of a special committee on "Validity and Reliability of Accreditation Standards." That report also proposed a policy addressing the basic question of the relevance of accreditation standards to quality of education, and that policy will be acted upon by the board at its April meeting. A statement on educational quality and accreditation that addresses the role of accreditation in ensuring quality will be issued after final approval by the executive committee, which is scheduled to consider it in December. This activity is an attempt to call public

attention to the fact that accreditation is vitally concerned with maintenance of quality. Most of the national reports, as one speaker mentioned yesterday, seem to have ignored that fact completely.

The COPA board also adopted a statement on rights and responsibilities that attempts to delineate the rights and responsibilities of both institutions and accrediting bodies in the accreditation process in an effort to minimize friction that sometimes occurs. The board continues to seek funding for the development and distribution of the common accreditation data base developed with the aid of a grant last year. This should help reduce the multiple requests for the same data that reach many of you from different accrediting bodies, so that all accrediting bodies can have a common base of data that is usable with mimimal additions.

The board has also authorized the executive committee to appoint a task force to study and make recommendations on the accreditation of foreign institutions and programs conducted by American institutions in foreign locations. A progress report on that study is due at the April meeting.

The board continues to note the need for greater presidential involvement in the activities of accrediting bodies, in commissions on accreditation, on accrediting teams and, for that matter, in controlling accrediting activities on our own campuses. COPA, I think feels--properly--that it cannot solve all of the problems. We see some analogies, I think Allan Ostar pointed out the other day, in the role of the presidents in trying to bring some order into deregulation of intercollegiate athletics. I think only through more direct presidential involvement will we be able to ensure that accreditation meets the needs of the colleges.

Report of the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges

Joyce Payne
Director

First, before I give my very brief report, I would like to take this opportunity, as always, to express my sincere appreciation to all the AASCU staff for supporting the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges (OAPBC), and particularly Allan Ostar and Harold Delaney, who I lean on very often for advice and consultation. As you know, and for the new presidents and chancellors here, OAPBC is sponsored by the Land-Grant Association in cooperation with AASCU. In the last three years we have gradually elevated the status and visibility of the Office for the Advancement of Public Black Colleges which represents 35 historically black public institutions and at the same time improved coordination of activities between policy and program imperatives fostered by AASCU and the Land-Grant Association. Accordingly, over the last year we have increased information dissemination about the goals and contributions of black colleges as highlighted in the *National Resource Guide*, which has been revised and will be mailed to member institutions within the next two weeks.

The *Resource Guide* targets and profiles some of the major concerns and contributions that historically black colleges have made over the last few decades. The office is also much more involved in national presentations that are not only germane to individual institutions but also foster greater coordination and involvement of black colleges in national associations. We collaborated in a number of ways with higher education associations concerning adult and continuing education and also with programs under the aegis of FIPSE, CAEL, ACE, and similar federal programs and advocacy associations. We are very much continuing our engagement with federal activities and organizations, and organizing individual institutional consultations between corporate representatives and federal representatives in our effort to increase involvement of historically black colleges in a number of federal programs where there are indications of disproportionate underrepresentation. For example, as a result, for the first time in the history of the Energy Auditing Program, under the Department of Energy, two black colleges are involved in the auditing program and we are now in the process of executing initiatives to involve at least two additional colleges. We are also much more involved in congressional activities and played a major role in the rewriting of Title III as a result of our participation on the Higher Education Task Force in One Dupont Circle, and also on the Title III Coaliation which represents a wide-range of higher education associations. In addition, we are continuing to monitor the White House initiative. Unfortunately, this

year we have experienced great difficulty in obtaining the final annual report. We intend to expand the analysis to 3 to 5 years and focus more on the extent to which policy imperatives initiated by the White House initiative are being met. Interestingly, over the last two years we have determined that the White House initiative staff accepted four of five recommendations made and they are now disaggregating data placing greater emphasis on private sector involvement. We are continuing to advocate that the initiative staff devote greater attention to creating incentives for private sector involvement and establishing policy directives for the 26 targeted federal agencies and particularly those indicating underrepresentation of black colleges. Unfortunately, current data indicate little or no change in the pattern of funding for black colleges. One of the primary concerns is that black colleges are still wedded to DOE, which represents about 76 percent of all of their support.

Approximately ten days ago, the Land-Grant Association held its annual meeting in Washington, DC. The OAPBC Advisory Committee decided that we would undertake two major initiatives for the upcoming year--the first initiative will address equity and excellence; the second will explore problems with teacher certification. As you know, AASCU is intensively involved in these program initiatives. Therefore, we plan to work with Harold Delaney and other AASCU staff to promote stronger coordination, and greater national attention to these issues.

The office is also engaged in exploring the feasibility of creating a public black college fund. Let me take this opportunity to sincerely thank Allan Watson for his assistance and definitive information about how one should go about establishing such a fund. We find that too often individuals and particularly major corporations are under the false impression that support of the United Negro College Fund also benefits public black colleges. We would use the fund mechanism to increase public awareness of academic programs, and research capabilities evolving on black college campuses. One of the primary goals is to bring development officers together with corporate leaders and representatives of the higher education community to talk about fund raising, alumni support, and successful public affairs and management strategies.

We are very much involved in looking at how we can elevate the capacity of black colleges by strengthening coordination between historically black colleges, community colleges, and state institutions. Many of the institutions represented in the audience today are already involved with black colleges in research and academic programs concerning recruitment and retention at the state level.

I thank you for this opportunity and look forward to your continued support.

Special Recommendation for Public Relations Campaign for State Colleges and Universities

George Ayers
President
Chicago State University, Illinois

I have the responsibility this afternoon, as Chairman Lucas indicated, to present to you a report on the public information campaign concept. As many of you who were in attendance this morning know, we had an opportunity to review with a firm we have selected, Kaufman and Associates, some of the aspects and components of a comprehensive campaign. We had an opportunity to hear precisely what they would be able to undertake for us and how it might affect the association. I don't think there is a need for us to discuss further the need for such a campaign and what it will do for the members of our association: that has been discussed in detail. I do feel that it is very important at this stage in our history and in our life at AASCU to consider seriously the undertaking of such an endeavor. This morning you also had an opportunity to hear what the cost would be for such an effort, so at this time the External Relations Committee would like to present to the membership for vote the proposal that we engage Kaufman and Associates to take on the development of a public information program for AASCU and that we have a fee assessment that would be included in our regular annual fees to cover the cost of this endeavor.

There are two additional points that are worthy of consideration and discussion: first, that this campaign would be undertaken for at least three years--we would start out the initial year as was indicated this morning, but two additional years would be involved; and second, it should be understood in undertaking a campaign that the External Relations Committee would be involved actively and would consider, review, examine, and criticize what the firm would be doing in an effort to help them and to facilitate what we would like to see done in terms of a public information campaign. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to present that as a resolution from the External Relations Committee to the members for their consideration.

Resolutions

The following resolutions were adopted by the membership.

Accuracy in Academia

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) endorse the following joint statement on Accuracy in Academia endorsed by a group of higher education associations, including the Association of American Colleges (AAC), the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), and others:

"We are concerned about the threat to academic freedom from a new organization called 'Accuracy in Academia' (AIA) which was formed by 'Accuracy in Media' to 'combat the dissemination of misinformation.' AIA encourages students in classrooms to record professors' statements and send them to AIA, who will determine whether they are correct. AIA says that it will ask the professors to acknowledge alleged errors and will publicize the professors' names and 'incorrect' statements.

We strongly oppose such activities for the following reasons:

- The classroom is a place of learning where the professor serves as intellectual guide, and all are encouraged to seek and express the truth as they see it. The presence in the classroom of monitors for an outside organization, which intends to decide what is accurate and then name professors it says are not, will inhibit academic freedom. Students will be discouraged from testing their ideas and professors will hesitate before presenting new or possibly controversial theories that would stimulate robust intellectual discussion.
- AIA announces that it is interested in combatting misinformation, but, in seeking accuracy in the complex world of ideas, it approaches its task with a clear and narrow mindset. The call is for accuracy in academia, but the goal is conformity with AIA's particular cast of mind. We oppose efforts by persons and groups, whether from the right or the left and whatever their special interests, to shut down classes or prevent speakers from being heard.
- AIA's claim that it can assess the correctness of what is said in the classroom is not only arrogant but hollow. The quality of academic performance is necessarily judged and controlled through peer evaluation by skilled professionals. Supervision of the evaluation process resides in boards of trustees that are responsible for ensuring both accountability and academic integrity while safeguarding the university from undue influence by politicians and pressure groups such as AIA.

We encourage colleges and universities to resist this assault on institutional integrity by reaffirming established practices for ensuring professional responsibility and academic freedom. We encourage legislators to continue their respect for that academic autonomy which

has enabled colleges and universities to serve the public interest rather than the special interests of political groups. We encourage the public to continue their support for the tradition of academic freedom essential to a democratic, diverse and free society."

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) adopt the following policy statement on the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation:

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities believes that the American system of voluntary, self-regulating accreditation is an essential means of ensuring quality in postsecondary education.

As the agency primarily responsible for preserving the integrity of the accrediting process, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) represents and serves the interests of all elements of the higher education community, including the college and university campuses, the national higher education organizations and the accrediting bodies.

To ensure that COPA continues its progress toward meeting its objectives, the active support and involvement of ech of those elements is required. AASCU therefore reaffirms its support of a strong, independent COPA, and calls upon other organizations to join in promoting understanding of accreditation and its role in quality assurance. AASCU is pleased to note that COPA is undertaking a comprehensive self-study, which is most timely, and is willing to participate in any appropriate way.

AASCU, as a member of COPA, calls upon the Council to review and strengthen its efforts:

- To ensure the relevance of accrediting standards and procedures of both institutional and specialized accrediting bodies to educational quality. We commend the recent Council report on Validity and Reliability of Accrediting Standards, but we believe the Council through the recognition process should continue to challenge overly specific quantitive standards. This is particularly the case where the standards may appear to be more related to the welfare of a profession than to the quality of preparation for entry into the professional field.
- To ensure that in the accrediting process both institutional and specialized accrediting bodies focus more clearly on institutional and program effectiveness, results and outcomes, than has been the case in the past.
- To strengthen the role of accrediting bodies in helping to encourage institutional freedom and autonomy. We endorse the Council's recent policy statement on "Rights and Responsibilities of Accrediting Bodies and Institutions in the Accrediting Process." We not only urge its effective use but call upon the Council to be constantly on guard against and to take effective action to discourage unreasonable or

arbitrary requirements imposed by accrediting bodies that threaten institutional rights and prerogatives, including the right to determine what degrees shall be offered.

- To prevent, through the national recognition process of the academic and accrediting communities, unnecessary, duplicative, or unneeded accrediting bodies. The reduction in number of accrediting bodies recognized by the Council in the last few years is to be commended, but further diligence is necessary.
- To encourage continual concern on the part of the accrediting bodies for the relevance of the arts and sciences to professional education not only on the undergraduate level but also in relation to appropriate prerequisites for graduate professional studies.
- To work with institutions and accrediting bodies to help ensure that accreditation is not misinterpreted or misused to promote the special interest of programs, departments, schools or institutions to the detriment of the integrity of institutions, the accrediting process or the quality of education offered.
- To work with the states to strengthen the role of nongovernmental accreditation in relation to state concerns with educational quality as reflected in statewide planning, program, review, incentives to quality improvement and authorization of institutions to operate and grant degrees.
- To explore and clarify with the states, the professional accrediting bodies, higher education institutions and educators and practitioners in the specialty fields what the relations among accreditation, licensure, and certification are or should be and to reduce linkage if and where it is not appropriate.

Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) recognize the Tenth Anniversary of Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act and commend the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development for its efforts to link U.S. higher education with international development needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That AASCU express its continued support for Title XII programs and stand ready to work cooperatively with the BIFAD in the future, especially with respect to increasing participation of AASCU institutions.

Agricultural Linkages

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) urge the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) to consider and to utilize the resources that exist in AASCU institutions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That AASCU urge the AID/BIFAD to develop linkages with these institutions to work together toward the mutual goal of reducing world hunger.

International Science and Education Council

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) express its appreciation to the United States Department of Agriculture and to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) for their efforts in proposing the revision of the agreement for the International Science and Education Council to include AASCU, and for their recognition of the potential contributions of AASCU institutions in international science and technology programs in the United States.

Morrill-Nelson Act

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) support the concept of expanding the Morrill-Nelson Act to include coordinated strengthening grant programs for higher education in agriculture, including the following:

(a) eligibility of all colleges and universities granting baccalaureate degrees in agriculture

(b) increasing funding of the program to meet the strengthening needs of all colleges and universities to ensure the necessary development of human capital required for a strong and dynamic U.S. agriculture.

National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) fully support the presidents of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) in their efforts to create a permanent formalized governance structure, called the Council of Presidents, that would have authority over NAIA staffing, budget, academic standards, and legislation.

Business and Industry Linkages

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) encourage all member institutions to work closely with business and industry to enhance the role of each in society, to foster mutual understanding, and to address economic development.

Higher Education Amendments of 1985

RESOLVED, That the members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) commend the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, especially Congressmen William D. Ford of Michigan and E. Thomas Coleman of Missouri, for their leadership in developing HR 3700, the Higher Education Amendments of 1985; and in particular for the commitment they have made to target student aid funds on the most needy; to provide additional grant funds to these

students; to make sure that women and minorities are treated equitably by the student aid system; and to restore a more appropriate balance between grant and loan assistance; and be it further

RESOLVED, That AASCU urge all members of the House to vote favorably on this legislation when it reaches the floor.

Higher Education Act

RESOLVED, That members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) urge members of Congress to end the practice of earmarking specific institutional projects in the Higher Education Act, and encourage Congress to develop allocation and eligibility criteria that will accommodate the legitimate needs of all institutions of higher education, and will permit all such institutions to compete equally for federal assistance.

House Resolution 258

RESOLVED, That the members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) support and urge members of Congress to support House Resolution 258, sponsored by Representatives Jeffords (R-VT) and Hawkins (D-CA), which declares that "(1) education should remain a vital national priority receiving at least the current level of tax incentives and (2) care should be taken to facilitate, rather than impair, state and local jurisdictions' efforts to raise revenues to support education and to encourage individuals to plan and save for educational expenses."

Gramm-Rudman Amendment

RESOLVED, That the members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) urge Congress to reject the Gramm-Rudman Amendment, and encourage Congress to develop a balanced deficit reduction initiative, which should consider the need for additional revenues as well as entitlement and expenditure reductions as the most equitable way of coming to grips with the federal deficit problem.

U.S. Scholarship Program for Developing Countries Act

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) urge support by its member institutions for the needed appropriations to implement a program, to be administered by the United States Information Agency (USIA), to bring a select number of international students to the United States for undergraduate study as authorized in the U.S. Scholarship Program for Developing Countries Act.

Research Programs at Member Institutions

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) should produce an annual publication to document research activities at member institutions that will include both

selected statistical information on research and development activities as well as highlight successful research programs at member institutions.

Educational Campaigns Related to AIDS

RESOLVED, That in looking at the legal, health, and political issues surrounding AIDS, each president or chancellor of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) be committed to accepting a leadership role in the development of policies and educational campaigns related to those issues; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such policies and educational campaigns shall be dedicated toward ensuring a proper balance among the rights of those individuals who may be carriers of or have contracted AIDS and all other members of the college or university community.

Urban Statement

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) adopt the following statement on "Urban Colleges and Universities: Missions and Responsibilities:"

Urban State Colleges and Universities

State-supported colleges and universities are one component of the infrastructure of a metropolitan area, as essential to urban life as social services, employment opportunities, or transportation. These institutions play an important role in the lives of urban residents and in the economic well-being of the cities.

The importance of public higher education to urban life is not difficult to understand. State-supported colleges and universities can help citizens make fundamental, positive changes in their lives. By providing affordable, accessible opportunities for high-quality postsecondary education, these institutions enable their students to achieve personal satisfaction as well as economic advancement.

The role of urban universities has become increasingly important since the 1960s, when opportunities for postsecondary education became synonymous with equal opportunity. As institutions located in areas with large populations, the urban universities were favorably placed to provide accessible, affordable, high-quality postsecondary education. Some urban institutions redirected their missions to focus more on equal educational opportunity; others were especially created to provide such opportunities. Between 1960 and 1985, approximately sixty-five new, comprehensive, urban public higher education institutions have opened their doors.

More recently, it has become clear that national and local economic development depend on a highly trained work force. Here, too, public colleges and universities are crucial. Helping citizens become productive, contributing members of society, postsecondary institutions

enrich their cities by providing continuing educational opportunities for working adults, which in turn helps maintain a vital urban economy.

Like all institutions of higher education, state-supported urban colleges and universities are committed to higher standards of education, basic and applied research and creative activity, and public service. The urban mission also means, however, that these institutions are committed to meeting the needs of a specific urban population and a specific metropolitan area. This policy statement outlines the twofold commitment of urban state-supported colleges and universities.

Educating Urban Students

The first priority of all institutions of higher education is to ensure the rigor of their academic programs. urban public colleges and universities carry out this responsibility through a diverse faculty meeting high standards of academic excellence.

This commitment to excellence, however, occurs in a nontraditional context for higher education in our cities. The student populations in today's urban colleges and universities reflect the demography of their surroundings. Students from minority gorups constitute a substantial portion of the student body. Furthermore, while urban institutions continue to serve 18-22-year-old students, all now have large adult student populations as well. In some colleges, too, there are many nonnative English speakers. Many students attend college part time, and most students hold full-time or part-time jobs. Virtually all commute to school and have significant responsibilities beyond the campus experience.

This broadened and diverse college population presents special challenges for urban institutions. Their academic program must serve a wide range of interests and needs. The goals and academic choices of younger students may differ significantly from those of adults. Moreover, many students have graduated from public school systems ill prepared for the demands of higher education. Yet urban colleges and universities now have the capacity to assist students in overcoming gaps in academic preparation that were once considered insurmountable barriers to higher education. Through experiment and experience, faculty and administrators have developed diagnostic processes to identify academic deficiencies and have devised learning techniques to help students correct their weaknesses. These activities are part of an urban institution's commitment to the students and to the city. Adults, especially, may move in and out of higher education as their personal and career needs dictate, creating special challenges in planning and program development at the urban institution.

With a substantial proportion of part-time students, urban universities encounter another difficulty in meeting student needs. Most part-time students at these institutions receive little or no financial assistance from the state or federal government. Indeed, they may be ineligible for such aid because they attend a low-cost school, or are

not enrolled for a sufficient number of hours. Nevertheless, they may have difficulty staying in school and completing their studies because of insufficient funds. Publicly supported urban colleges and universities are obligated to find ways of providing financial support to such students.

At the same time, urban colleges and universities have a major responsibility to remain accessible to all city residents. Many institutions now fulfill this duty by providing instruction wherever it is most needed. Faculty members still teach in classrooms, but those classrooms may be located in a plant, a bank building, a senior citizens' center, a person's home, or a city hall.

Research and the Urban Area

The advancement of knowledge is also a fundamental commitment to every institution of higher education. Urban universities share this commitment and also have a special mission to conduct basic and applied research and creative activities in the service of their cities. Individual faculty members and colleges and universities set their own agenda for research, of course, but in the urban college or university, the research agenda often includes helping cities to solve local problems in such areas as schooling, transportation, or social services.

Urban colleges and universities can serve, therefore, as natural centers for developing and collecting research and data on a wide range of issues affecting urban life. Such an institution can support a city's need to have a coordinated research and data base on metropolitan area trends in order to assist in developing long-range plans for public services.

More recently, cooperative research relationships between business and education are becoming increasingly common and important to the nation's economic, scientific, and technological development. In this new area of partnerships, urban colleges and universities are taking a leading role in promoting cooperation between the public and private sectors.

Public Service in the Urban Community

The public-service function is particularly important for publicly supported urban colleges and universities. These institutions are partners in the economic, cultural, and social lives of the cities. As partners, they contribute in a multitude of ways to urban vitality, educating students in the traditions and values of the liberal arts and sciences and adding significantly to the citizenry's ability to make informed judgments on complex urban issues.

Economically, the urban university collaborates with business, industry, the public sector, and organizations of workers in the local labor market to achieve several goals. The university seeks to ensure that its programs are relevant to the continuing education needs of the

labor force, and provides ways to increase learning opportunities for faculty and staff members, students, and workers. And, the university fosters a proper balance in its programs between preparation for employment and advancement, and the acquisition of the other measurable and immeasurable benefits traditionally associated with a college education. The urban public college or university also plays a crucial role in the dissemination and transfer of technology vital to business and economic development.

Culturally, urban public colleges and universities benefit cities in two important ways. First, they stimulate people to support the development and growth of cultural institutions and activities. Second, urban colleges themselves, are centers of cultural activity, hosting artistic performances, providing library services, sponsoring lectures, and discussing urban issues. These activities are important public services rendered by any urban college or university.

Socially, urban institutions bring together the diverse populations in the city, providing them with a common experience and the values of a liberal education and creating opportunities for increased communication and understanding among the diverse sectors of the city's people.

Showcase for Excellence Awards Program

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) continue the Showcase for Excellence Awards Program competition in 1986.

Enhancement of the Teaching Profession

RESOLVED, That an additional dimension be included in the Showcase for Excellence Awards competition of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) in 1986 through which AASCU citations may be awarded simultaneously to the governors of three states which have made the most significant progress in recent years in enacting legislation contributing to the enhancement of the teaching profession.

Teacher Preparation and Teacher Performance

RESOLVED, That the Task Force on Excellence in Education of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) develop a matrix of information obtained from AASCU members describing whether and how the major issues in teacher preparation and teacher performance on AASCU campuses are being addressed and be it further

RESOLVED, That, in developing this matrix, the Task Force be authorized: (1) to survey AASCU institutions early in 1986 in an effort to assess the extent to which governing boards, presidents, other administrative officers, and faculty members are dealing with the issues; (2) to use the information gathered in the survey to prepare a report for general circulation assessing how effectively AASCU institutions are addressing the issue; and (3) to arrange a series of meetings

between AASCU representatives and other groups concerned with teacher preparation and teacher performance to present examples drawn from the survey illustrating how AASCU institutions are actively involved in educational reforms.

Professional Challenges for Teachers

RESOLVED, That, at the four regional seminars to be sponsored by the new National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities in 1986, priority concern be given to the question of how the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) teacher education programs can respond most effectively to the professional challenges "the new demographics" pose for the teachers of tomorrow.

Commendation

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) acknowledge and express appreciation to the following presidents and chancellors of member institutions in Florida who, as hosts, set a tone of hospitality in their membership reception and provided staff support for the AASCU office and registration desk during the association's 25th Annual Meeting at the Sheraton Hotel in Bal Harbour, Florida: Chancellor Charles Reed, State University System of Florida; President Frederick Humphries, Florida A & M University; President Trevor Colbourn, University of Central Florida; President Curtis L. McCray, University of North Florida; President John Lott Brown, University of South Florida; and President James A. Robinson, University of West Florida; and be it further

RESOLVED, That special gratitude be expressed to President Helen Popovich of Florida Atlantic University and to President Gregory B. Wolfe of Florida International University who, as primary hosts, advised the association in planning special events and logistical details for the meeting.

Memorial Statement in Honor of M. M. Chambers

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) adopt the following memorial statement in honor of M. M. Chambers; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the statement be forwarded to Illinois State University to be placed in the official archives of AASCU:

M. M. Chambers, 1899-1985

"The American higher education community was diminished on November 15 with the death of M. M. Chambers, a giant among the scholars in our profession.

As professor of higher education at Illinois State University since 1969, and, before that, as a member of the faculties of Indiana University and the University of Michigan, Dr. Chambers was recognized as the nation's foremost authority on the financing and governance of public higher education. His thirty years of service as editor of *Grapevine*, the most widely quoted source of information on state appropriations for higher education, made his name a lodestar to his peers. He was unstinting in his championship of public higher education as a precious investment in the future of his country, which he served as a member of the United States Air Force during World War II.

His passing leaves the American Association of State Colleges and Universities deeply saddened--and eternally in his debt."

President Williams Named Honorary Chairman of AASCU

President Ronald Williams served as the 1985 chair-elect of the Board of Directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). On November 26, he was to have been installed as the 1986 chair. Taking into account President Williams' wishes, the board recognized that he was unable to assume the regular duties of the chair, but chose, nevertheless, to vote him a special and unprecedented recognition. The following remarks were made at the evening session of the AASCU meeting on November 26, 1985, in Bal Harbour, Florida.

Aubrey K. Lucas, 1985 Chair of the AASCU Board of Directors, and President, University of Southern Mississippi

"It was mentioned earlier today in the Council of Presidents that our Chair-elect Ron Williams is ill and will be unable to assume the duties as AASCU's chair in 1986. We in AASCU value the significant contributions which Ron has made to our association and to all of public higher education. The Board of Directors has wholeheartedly endorsed a proposal to designate Ron as Honorary Chair of AASCU in tribute to the enthusiasm and the unyielding dedication which he has brought to all of his endeavors. Our hearts go out to Ron, to Arlene, and to their family in this extremely difficult time, and we want them to know that they remain certainly in our thoughts and in our prayers.

"Representing Ron tonight is John Cownie. John is provost at Northeastern Illinois University, and we would like John to come forward and to accept this gavel for Ron, as Ron is designated the Honorary Chair of AASCU for 1986 . . . John."

John Cownie

"Thank you very much. It is a most distinct honor for me to be asked to represent Ron here tonight. As you know he is gravely ill, and nothing less would have kept him from this ceremony, for he values you as friends and he values AASCU extremely highly. This is obviously an occasion in which we share some of the sadness that goes with Ron's situation, and our hearts do go out to Ron, Arlene, their family, and all the people who have known and worked with Ron. On the other hand, Ron's whole life has been one of hope and accomplishment and of giving inspiration to others, and it is that greater sense that we ought to take away from this meeting as we think about Ron and as we have our best hopes for him in the days ahead.

"I have often asked myself what motivates someone like Ron Williams to do the kinds of things that he does. As long as I have worked with him, Ron has perpetually been offered opportunities which would have made him more money, which might have led to greater fame or at least to more material comforts. He has turned all of those down because, I think, of an overriding belief in some of the things that AASCU stands

for. He keeps foremost in mind the idea that the American society should be more equal, more just, and one of greater opportunity than it in fact is. He recognizes the role of AASCU institutions in providing measures of equality, justice, and opportunity for those who have been shut out of higher education for far too long. He also keeps in mind the pragmatic realities of life in America today, and it is by maintaining a certain realism that he has been able to sustain his idealism over a very long period of time. The paradox, I think, is only apparent. Ron is never bitter when a particular goal does not come as quickly as one might hope, or when a hoped for achievement is pushed off far into the future or even denied. He sees his role as pushing ahead, of trying to motivate others, and of trying to make sure the institutions and the organizations which he represents fulfill their missions insofar as that is possible.

"If Ron were here tonight the last thing in the world he would try to do is give you an exact blueprint for what our organization should do. Ron is not a believer in exact blueprints. He is a believer in following principles and in adapting his actions to the necessities of particular situations. He views the current debate over access and quality in AASCU institutions with what I think is a very valuable perspective. 'Access' and 'quality' both stand as good words, as words which no one can be against. Yet, they were not yesterday's words, and they may not be tomorrow's words. While we focus on the actual issues which come out of our commitment to working for greater quality while maintaining access, we have to keep in mind what our institutions stand for, and we have to make sure that today's catchwords are defined in ways which do nto subvert the missions of our institutions.

"Similarly, as great attention has been turned nationally toward the so-called crisis in our schools and the need to reevaluate our teacher-training programs, Ron has brought a perspective which I would like to share with you. With respect to the schools, Ron has been fond of saying that the periodic rediscovery of a crisis in our schools is almost as guaranteed and as regular as many other natural events. Every so many decades it is proclaimed that there is a crisis in our schools. That may be true, but the discovery also ties to something else that Ron believes firmly, that while Americans do profit from their educational system, they very often expect all too much of it. They expect the educational system, both at the elementary and the secondary level and also at the university level, to solve all the problems of society. Americans are able to be amazed that somehow schools which take in children from deprived backgrounds, from situations that are economically and socially untenable, somehow do not miraculously turn these children into the equals of those who come to schools from far more privileged backgrounds. Americans are able to wonder that institutions such as AASCU institutions providing opportunity to families and to individuals who have never before had it, somehow seem to fall short if measured against criteria defined by and for the elite institutions in

our society. We simply cannot accept those definitions and we cannot accept that measure of our success. Ron has never accepted them. He has rather measured success against what he has been able to do and try to do for those institutions and organizations which he has served, and I think by any standard both Ron and his institutions have prospered.

"In summary, I would say Ron would hold out to us the hope of greater equality, greater justice, greater opportunity for many Americans. He would not be dissuaded by the fact that perfection is not just over the horizon. He would rather redouble his efforts to achieve as much as he possibly could. As recently as about three weeks ago, Ron and Arlene still hoped that they would be here with you tonight. As it turned out, that was impossible, and Ron's last public event was an anti-apartheid demonstration which he led on the streets of Chicago in front of the South African consulate. On that occasion as on many others, I heard Ron asked what pushes him on, why did he do this at a time when he was in a wheelchair, and when his strength was obviously failing. He gave the same kind of answer that he has always given to that question both before his illness was known and since. Ron has always said, 'I have to live as if what I do will make a difference.' There are two edges to that comment. The first is that I think that Ron's life has made a difference. the second is that whether or not it made a difference, he has always felt there was no choice but to live that way. He commented to Bill Kurtis, who interviewed him for CBS-TV on the occasion of the demonstration, 'that I really do this for myself more than for the people of South Africa. I do it because I have to feel that I have done all that I could, that when I haven't been able to do as much as I wished, I still did all that it was possible for me to do.' I think that it is the challenge that Ron leaves with us and with AASCU for 1986 and for the years beyond."

Ronald Williams died on December 11, 1985.

Election of Officers and Directors

The chair of the nominating committee, President George E. Ayers, Chicago State University, Illinois, presented the following slate of candidates, which was unanimously approved by the membership.

Chairman: Stephen Horn, president, California State University, Long Beach; Chairman-Elect: Hoke Smith, president, Towson State University, Maryland; Honorary Chairman: Ronald Williams, president, Northeastern Illinois University*; Directors: Jewel Plummer Cobb, president, California State University, Fullerton (three-year term); Earl Lazerson, president, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville (three-year term); Margaret Preska, president, Mankato State University, Minnesota (three-year term); Louis Rodriguez, president, Midwestern State University, Texas (three-year term); Fred J. Taylor, chancellor, University of Arkansas at Monticello (two-year term); and Stanley P. Wagner, president, East Central University, Oklahoma (two-year term).

Of the slate of eight presidents and chancellors submitted as candidates for the four positions open on the 1986 nominating committee, the following were elected to serve two-year terms as a result of a written ballot: Warren B. Armstrong, president, Wichita State University (KS); H. Douglas Covington, president, Alabama A & M University; Olin B. Sansbury, chancellor, University of South Carolina at Spartanburg; and Robert Woodbury, president, University of Southern Maine.

The following members also served on the 1985 nominating committee: Alan E. Guskin, chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Parkside; Joseph B. Johnson, president, Grambling State University, Louisiana; Michael Paradise, chancellor, University of Alaska, Juneau; Helen Popovich, president, Florida Atlantic University; G. Robert Ross, president, Western Washington University; Natale A. Sicuro, president, Southern Oregon State College; Leonard O. Spearman, president, Texas Southern University; and Kala M. Stroup, Murray State University, Kentucky.

* **Note:** President Williams was to have assumed the chairmanship of AASCU in 1986; however, because of severe illness he was unable to fill that position.